DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 732 24 EA 004 360

AUTHOR Teitelbaum, Deena; Lee, James C.

TITLE Development of Selection Criteria for Elementary School Principals of Inner City Schools. Final Report.

INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, New York, N.Y. Board of Examiners.

SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.

BUREAU NO BR-9-B-147

PUB DATE Mar 72

GRANT OEG-2-70-0003(059)

NOTE 104p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58

DESCRIPTORS Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Selection; *Criteria; Educational Administration; *Elementary Schools; Evaluation Criteria; Individual Characteristics; Personnel Selection; *Principals; Questionnaires; Standards; *Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

This study concerned itself primarily with the development of criteria for the selection of inner city school elementary school principals using New York City as the prototype for other large urban centers. Groups of professional educators and lay community representatives indicated on questionnaires the five most important personal characteristics and the five most important professional experiences and characteristics they considered important in the selection of elementary school principals. Thirty-three categories evolved from content analysis of the responses. Comparisons among communities and among personnel groups showed statistically significant agreement concerning the rank order of professional and personal characteristics they considered important in elementary school principal selection in New York City. (RA)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

9-B-147 NCERD
PA24 OE-BR
Received EA/4D
John Sokol 5/4/72

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 9-B-147
Grant No. OEG-2-70-0003 (059)

Dr. John Sokol
Director, Educational Research
DHEW-OFFICE OF EDUCATION - RM 1013
Federal Building
26 Federal Plaza
New York, New York 10007

DEVELOPMENT OF SELECTION CRITERIA FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS OF INNER CITY SCHOOLS

Prepared by
Deena Teitelbaum, Project Director
James C. Lee, Research Assistant

March 1972

ED 062 732

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT UNIT
BOARD OF EXAMINERS
MURRAY ROCKOWITZ, CHAIRMAN
BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to
In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

EA 004 360

DEVELOPMENT OF SELECTION CRITERIA FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS OF INNER CITY SCHOOLS

P R E F A C E

The development of selection criteria for principals of inner city elementary schools was originated under the supervision of Murray Rockowitz formerly Examiner in Charge of the Research and Development Unit of the Board of Examiners of the Board of Education of the City of New York and currently the Chairman of the Board of Examiners.

The investigators wish to express their sincere appreciation to each of the school administrators, teachers, secretaries, Community School Board members, Board of Education members, parents, and members of Community Corporations and Planning Committees who furnished data, and without whose cooperation this study would not have been possible.

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

BOARD OF EXAMINERS
Board of Education of
The City of New York

New York, New York

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE PROBLEM 1

I. Title 1
II. The Problem 1
III. Related Literature 2
IV. Related Leadership Research 4
V. Analysis of the Problem 7

PROCEDURE 8

I. Population Selection 8
A. Definition 8
B. Sampling Design 9
C. Selection of Schools 9
D. Selection of Personnel in Schools 10
E. Instrument Development 11
F. Techniques Used for Analysis of Data 12

THE FINDINGS 19

I. Population Response 19
II. Response to Question 21 20
III. Response to Question 22 45

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 79

I. Summary 79
II. Findings and Conclusions 81
III. Recommendations 82
IV. Limitations 83

BIBLIOGRAPHY 84

APPENDIX 86

TABLES

Number		Page
1	Number of Questionnaires Sent and Returned, and Per Cent of Return by Personnel Strata	19
2	Rank Order Correlations Between Experimental and Control Groups, Question 21	22
3	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Total Experimental vs. Total Control	23
4	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Administrators, Experimental vs. Control	24
5	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Teachers, Experimental vs. Control	25
6	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Secretaries, Experimental vs. Control	26
7	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Community Boards, Experimental vs. Control	27
8	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Parents, Experimental vs. Control	28
9	Rank Order Correlations Between Total Groups in Each Position, Question 21	29
10	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Administrators vs. Teachers	30
11	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Administrators vs. Secretaries	31
12	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Administrators vs. Professors	32
13	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Administrators vs. Community Boards	33
14	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Administrators vs. Parents	34
15	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Teachers vs. Secretaries	35
16	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Teachers vs. Professors	36
17	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Teachers vs. Community Boards	37

Number		Page
18	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Teachers vs. Parents	38
19	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Secretaries vs. Professors	39
20	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Secretaries vs. Community Boards	40
21	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Secretaries vs. Parents	41
22	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Professors vs. Community Boards	42
23	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Professors vs. Parents	43
24	Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics, Community Boards vs. Parents	44
25	Rank Order Correlations Between Experimental and Control Groups, Question 22	45
26	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Total Experimental vs. Total Control	47
27	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Administrators, Experimental vs. Control	48
28	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Teachers, Experimental vs. Control	49
29	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Secretaries, Experimental vs. Control	50
30	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Community Boards, Experimental vs. Control	51
31	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Parents, Experimental vs. Control	52
32	Rank Order Correlations Between Total Groups in Each Position, Question 22	53
33	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Administrators vs. Teachers	55
34	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Administrators vs. Secretaries	56
35	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Administrators vs. Professors	57

Number		Page
36	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Administrators vs. Community Boards	58
37	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Administrators vs. Parents	59
38	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Teachers vs. Secretaries	60
39	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Teachers vs. Professors	61
40	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Teachers vs. Community Boards	62
41	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Teachers vs. Parents	63
42	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Secretaries vs. Professors	64
43	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Secretaries vs. Community Boards	65
44	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Secretaries vs. Parents	66
45	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Professors vs. Community Boards	67
46	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Professors vs. Parents	68
47	Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics, Community Boards vs. Parents	69
48	Coefficient of Concordance, Ranking of Nineteen Categories by Ten Experimental and Control Groups, Question 21	71
49	Coefficient of Concordance, Ranking of Nineteen Categories by Six Total Personnel Groups, Question 21	73
50	Coefficient of Concordance, Ranking of Fourteen Categories by Ten Experimental and Control Groups, Question 22	75
51	Coefficient of Concordance, Ranking of Fourteen Categories by Six Total Personnel Groups, Question 22	77
52	Categories in Rank Order of Response to Questions 21 and 22, by Total Population	80

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

I Title: Development of Selection Criteria for Elementary School Principals of Inner City Schools.

II The Problem:

The Board of Examiners of New York City is an organization unique in the nation. It functions under the constitutional mandate of the State to select school personnel independently of the Board of Education under whose jurisdiction it falls. It is responsible only to the State Commissioner of Education and to the courts for the conduct of its operation.

One of the prime objectives of the Board of Examiners is to select the ablest school administrators available, administrators who can serve as heads of schools which seek to meet the individual needs of pupils in the diversified communities of New York City, especially those who live in the inner city. This objective is urgent in the light of greater recognition of the need for leadership in the inner city, of increasing demands for public accountability of educational leaders, and for community participation in the choice of school leaders.

The principal of an inner city school particularly, is acknowledged by professionals and laymen alike to play a critical role in the implementation of school programs. He must relate to his staff; he must be able to work effectively with the community; he must be sensitive to the needs of a multi-ethnic student body. In addition to being a capable administrator he must exert creative leadership to effect needed change. As a result, traditional selection criteria have been subject to critical review but most of that review is carried out by persons who seek to justify previously formed judgments and who do so without reference to objective research, however limited, in the area.

The urban crisis as it affects education puts a premium on administrators who are capable of leadership essential for the professional growth of teaching and para-professional personnel in inner city schools, for effecting meaningful involvement of the school with the community and its resources, and for exercising the administrative and supervisory functions necessary for the development of a creative learning environment for all children in the urban setting but particularly for disadvantaged children, most of whom are to be found among the city's ethnic minorities.

To improve the process of selection of outstanding educaticnal leaders it is necessary to:

a. Assess past selection procedures

b. Develop new criteria for selection (this study)

c. Develop selection procedures based upon newly defined selection criteria.

This study concerns itself primarily with the development of criteria for selection of elementary school principals for inner city schools using New York City as the prototype for other large urban centers.

III Related Literature

Currently, the professional journals, lay magazines, and local newspapers are devoting considerable space to the consideration of the nationwide problem of education in the inner city school. The quality of education in large urban areas has been questioned by parents, community groups, national organizations, and professional educators. The effectiveness of the urban school, its teachers and administrators, has been compared unfavorably with that of the suburban school.

Public education in New York City involves a staff of 88,000 pedagogical and administrative employees, a physical plant of 900 buildings and an annual expenditure of more than $1,300,000,000. It is recognized as the largest urban school system in the nation. Its problems are unique and yet comparable to the problems faced in any large urban center.

Brownell [1] points to the great effect of social and economic development on the city schools. In New York City the school population reflects the changes of the population of the city itself. The New York City Department of Health reports that during the decade from 1950 to 1960 there was a loss of 12.9 per cent in the white population, a gain of 47.7 per cent in non-white population, and a gain of 148.7 per cent in the Puerto Rican population. More than half of the elementary school population at present is made up of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils. More than thirteen per cent of the elementary school pupil population at present is considered non-English speaking. It is urgent that the urban school be examined within the context of the demographic changes in the community. Eddy [2] focuses on the problem of whether the traditional structure of the school, based on middle-class values and educational techniques, will ever succeed in city areas with different values. She examines some of the consequences of schooling for the child in the slum neighborhood. Crosby [3] questions the future education of slum children in much the same manner. She points to the relationship between poverty and "(1) lack of mobility (the challenge to move upward on the economic ladder) (2) lack of motivation and favorable self-concept, and (3) educational lag."

[1] S. M. Brownell, "Schools in the Cities," Vital Speeches, Vol. 1, April 1965, pp. 380-384.

[2] Elizabeth M. Eddy, Urban Education and Child of the Slum. New York: Project True, Hunter College, 1965.

[3] Muriel Crosby, "Poverty and the School," Educational Leadership, Vol. 22, No. 7, May 1965, pp. 536-539.

Alexander Moore[4] reports field observations of classroom behavior in selected elementary schools in lower-income areas. He notes that recent migration, low-income, and ethnic culture characteristics combine to make children "foreign" to their "new" teachers. Greene and Ryan[5], too, feel that the New York school system has failed to understand and adapt to the needs of these children.

Schueler[6] examines urban education in a more comprehensive manner. He argues that the major problem facing the school is de facto segregation. Plans for integrating urban schools (such as redistricting and vertical reorganization) will reduce de facto segregation but not alleviate poverty, prejudice, and ignorance. He summarizes educational plans that have been proposed, and in some instances carried out, and suggests: (1) providing nursery schools and day care centers for preschool children; (2) providing enriched curricula geared directly to disadvantaged students; (3) utilizing services of professionals in guidance and psychology; (4) increasing the availability of the school for the community; (5) attempting to bridge the gap between student and teacher behavior; (6) developing research and training centers; (7) increasing communication between educational and social service agencies; and (8) expanding low-cost educational opportunities beyond the compulsory school age.

Frank Riessman[7] discusses the need for new manpower and techniques to enable schools to respond to the needs and styles of disadvantaged children. He stresses the need for non-professionals among the poor to serve as teacher assistants and teacher aides. Sacadat[8] details techniques for arousing parent interest in the schools. She suggests informal meetings and newsletters. She reports that the highlight of the experimental program in one school was an integrated family bus trip (out-of-town).

[4] Alexander Moore, Urban School Days: Selected Days in Urban Elementary School Life. New York: Project True, Hunter College, 1964.

[5] Mary Greene and Orletta Ryan, The School Children: Growing up in the Slums New York: Pantheon Books, 1965.

[6] Herbert Schueler, "Education in the Modern Urban Setting", Law and Contemporary Problems; Vol.30 No. 1, Winter 1965, pp. 162-175.

[7] Frank Riessman, It's Time for a Moon-Shot in Education, New York: Albert Einstein College of Medicine, October 1965.

[8] Evelyn Sacadat, "Arousing Parent Interest in a Program for the Culturally Deprived", Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 34, No. 2, Spring 1965, pp. 195-196.

Wilkerson[9] presents a comprehensive discussion of the reports of ten investigations that evaluated the effects of compensatory educational programs and practices relating to: (1) reading improvement programs for migrants; (2) using multiracial reading materials; (3) pre-school programs; and (4) drop-out programs.

Decentralization of the New York City School system may result in greater autonomy for each school and greater responsibility for each principal. The National Education Association[10] raises pertinent questions that need to be considered concerning our educational leaders. (1) "How well prepared is the individual principal to meet the demands that will fall upon the principalship during the next decade? (2) How can the principal help members of the faculty to redirect their attitudes, planning, and procedures so as to provide better educational opportunities for all children? (3) Where will the schools find the types of new teachers that the next decade will require? (4) What does the future hold with regard to the role of parents in the education of their children? (5) What adjustments must be made to the innovations and projects in various phases of elementary education which have recently emerged as a result of increasing amounts of federal aid?"

IV Related Leadership Research

Charters[11] indicates that some of the earlier studies in administrative behavior were concerned with the absence or presence of a supervisory relationship; these studies compared pupil achievement under supervised and unsupervised teachers. More recent studies have been concerned with the character or style of the relationship, especially as its tone is set up by the administrative officer in the school. Hardly a textbook on school administration fails to invoke the distinction between autocratic and democratic leadership. A review of research of the last twenty years on leadership behavior in education indicates a paucity of studies. Studies have centered upon administrative behavior on the job and established interpersonal relationships which affect staff behavior and achievement. Almost completely absent from the research is the conception of leadership as exercised in the perception of problems and in envisaging possible solutions to them. The following studies do not attack this conceptualization of the leadership criterion.

[9] Doxey Wilkerson, "Programs and Practices in Compensatory Education for Disadvantaged Children", Review of Educational Research Vol. 35, No. 5, 1965, pp. 426-440.

[10] The Elementary School Principalship in 1968: A Research Study, Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association 1968.

[11] W.W. Charters, Jr., Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Behavior, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Project No. 929, 1964.

Halpin [12] describes the dichotomy between "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration." He is concerned with style, administrative implementation, and role perception. Initiating structure refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of his work group. Consideration refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his staff. Halpin used the(LBDQ) Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire to measure leader behavior and idiology.

Stice et al.[13] concern themselves with the use of simulation to determine performance in school administration. The In-Basket technique yielded objective data which were interpreted to discover patterns that might be predictive. Their population consisted of over two hundred principals from all parts of the country. In addition to the objective techniques used, the study population was evaluated by their supervisors, their teaching staff, the research staff, and a lay group. It was noted that length of experience and personality are factors that should be considered during selection procedures.

In a later publication, Hemphill et al.[14] state that the evidence on the value of experience is not as clear-cut as the professional educator might like. They report a clear leadership factor did not emerge from the study. They state that, "administrative performance is a concept larger than leadership," where perhaps the opposite is a more plausible hypothesis. They offer the following set of primary factors in administrative performance:
a) Exchanging Information; b) Discussing with Others Before Acting;
c) Complying with Suggestions Made By Others; d) Analyzing the Situation;
e) Maintaining Organizational Relationship; f) Organizing Work; g) Responding to Outsiders; and h) Directing the Work of Others.

In a study for Educational Testing Service, Lindley[15] lists eleven criteria used by superintendents when selecting principals. The three most important qualifications reported by the study population are: knowledge of administrative process, breadth of general education, and ability to work with others. The superintendents in large school systems reported the following techniques currently used in selecting administrative personnel:

1. Review of Training or Formal College Preparation
2. Review of Recommendations or Credentials
3. Review of Previous Experience
4. Written Objective Tests
5. Written Essay Tests
6. Oral Interviews
7. On-the-Job Performance Evaluations

[12] Andrew Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration: MacMillan, New York, 1966.

[13] G. Stice, N. Fredericksen, J.Hemphill, D.Griffiths, Criteria of Performance on School Administration, Research Memorandum R.M. 60-17. Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 1960.

[14] J. Hemphill, D. Griffiths, N. Fredericksen, Administrative Performance and Personality, New York: Teachers College, 1962.

[15] Jessie B. Lindley, The Use of Tests in the Selection of Administrative and Supervisory School Personnel, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J. 1965.

Gross and Herriott [16] utilize the questionnaire and, to a limited degree, the interview to determine the degree of EPL (executive professional leadership) on the part of principals. The authors' sample consisted of one hundred and seventy-five principals, their supervisors, and a sample of teachers.

Erickson [17] points out that research in this area makes heavy use of descriptive questionnaires dealing with administrative behavior. For the most part the studies are concerned with styles of action and interpersonal relationships and set value judgments on both, associating favorable characteristics with the so-called idographic or transactional administrator and unfavorable with the nomothetic. He is critical of both the conception and conduct of these studies.

On the other hand, Brown [18] insists that description questionnaires have a place in research in this area especially because of the susceptibility of descriptive statements to projective distortion. Brown proposes that leadership be regarded as a transactional phenomenon determined both by the leader's and the followers' behavior. As such, leadership might with validity be measured by description questionnaires.

Industrial personnel research indicates an attempt to identify and define leadership or management skills. The "Management Progress Study" of A. T. and T. under the direction of Bray (1964) is primarily concerned with techniques to improve the selection and advancement of management personnel. A survey of line supervisors led to the development of the following as management variables:

1. Scholastic Aptitude
2. Energy
3. Personal Impact
4. Sensitivity to Others
5. Leadership Skills
6. Behavior Flexibility
7. Self-Evaluation
8. Oral Communication Skill
9. Written Communication Skill
10. Range of Interests
11. Reading Comprehension
12. Organizing and Planning Skills
13. Decision-Making Skills
14. Company Attitudes
15. Need Approval of Supervisors
16. Need Approval of Peers
17. Inner Work Standards
18. Resistance to Stress

16 N. Gross, R. E. Herriott, Staff Leadership in Public Schools, New York: John Willey and Sons, 1965

17 Donald A. Erickson, "The School Administrator", Review of Educational Research, Vol. 37, No. 4, October 1967, pp. 417-432.

18 Allan Brown, "Reactions to Leadership", Educational Administration Quarterly Vol. 3, Winter 1967, pp. 62-73

Used in the assessment program are paper and pencil tests; group situation tests involving simulation technique; role-playing and observed leaderless discussion; work-situation tests using In-Basket technique; and individual interviews. Other programs [19] such as those used in the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, Sears Roebuck and Co., International Business Machines, Standard Oil Co. of Ohio, General Electric, the Proctor and Gamble Co., and Montgomery Ward underscore the importance that industry places on continuing efforts to identify potential leadership.

Alexander [20] indicates that a scoring mechanism to be used with simulation technique can be developed by "operationalizing criterion." Role-playing situational tests have limited reliability. Reliability may be improved through the refinement of techniques such as the use of videotapes and more rigorous training of raters. Two crucial points are made concerning the function of a leader:

1. A function of a leader (principal) is to sort out important facts from the confusion of events surrounding him and identify the essence of a problem as it arises. An effective leader recognizes when a problem exists and is able to identify it correctly.

2. When more than one course of action is feasible in the solution of a problem, the effective leader is capable of evaluating the consequences of each alternative.

V Analysis of the Problem:

The problem is approachable through a series of subordinate problems. This study focuses upon the development of criteria identifying the unique professional and personal characteristics of the successful inner city elementary school principal. These criteria must be realistic, going beyond static textbook descriptions which are frequently limited to principles of school administration and organization. An educational system must respond to and reflect the needs of the community for the kind of educational leadership which recognizes unique community problems and potentialities. Criteria for success as an elementary school principal is developed by involving populations which represent the complexity of the City of New York. A representative sample of individuals and organizations constitutes the study population used in the development of criteria.

The questionnaire technique was utilized. This technique was chosen because of the nature of the data necessary to answer the problem posed. In addition, the questionnaire provides wide coverage for a minimum expense in money and effort. It reaches persons who are otherwise difficult to contact and permits selection of a large and representative sample.

19 Felix Lopez, Evaluating Executive Decision Making, American Management Association Inc. 1966.

20 L. Alexander, S. Lockwood, R. Owens, C. Steinhoff, A Demonstration of the Use of Simulation in the Training of Administrators, Office of Research and Evaluation, Division of Teacher Education of the City of New York, 1967.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE

I. Population Selection

A. Definition: This study involved two basic populations; professional educators and community representatives.

1. For the purposes of this study, professional educators were limited to:

a. District Superintendent - There are 31 school districts in the City of New York, each under the direction of a District or Community Superintendent.

b. Principals - There are approximately 531 licensed elementary school principals in the New York City school system functioning as heads of school units. For the purposes of this study, an elementary school unit included any combination of grade levels which include the span of kindergarten through six.

c. Assistant Principals - There are approximately 964 licensed assistant principals assigned to public elementary schools in the City of New York.

d. Teachers - There are approximately 28,558 licensed teachers in the public schools in the City of New York.

e. School Secretaries - There are approximately 1,494 school secretaries assigned to public elementary schools in New York City.

f. Professors of school administration and organization - There are approximately 30 institutions of higher education containing schools or departments of education in the City of New York.

2. For the purposes of this study, community representatives were limited to:

a. Board of Education - There are five members of the Board of Education of the City of New York.

b. Local School Boards - At present, there are 31 local school boards in the City of New York. There are approximately nine members on each local school board.

c. Parents Organizations - There are various parents organizations functioning in the public elementary schools of New York City.

d. Community Corporations and Planning Committees (Funded by grants from the Office of Economic Opportunity and the City of New York as allocated by the New York City Council Against Poverty through the Community Development Agency of the Human Resources Administration).

B. Sampling Design

A twenty per cent stratified multi-stage random sampling technique was utilized. As a means of increasing precision and representativeness, stratification of the sub-populations defined above were utilized.

A multi-stage procedure was undertaken in the selection of teachers, school secretaries, and college professors. In the selection of teachers, for example,all elementary schools in the City of New York constituted the pool from which a random selection of schools was made. From these randomly selected schools, a random selection of teachers was made from the total teacher population of each school.

There was consistent delimitations of the magnitude of the populations within each strata. In those strata, where the total population was so limited that a twenty per cent random sample yielded a number too small for meaningful interpretation, a proportionately larger per cent of that total population was selected. On the other hand, when a twenty per cent random sample of a stratum yielded a number far in excess of that needed for meaningful interpretation, a proportionately smaller per cent was selected.

C. Selection of Schools

Definition: For the purpose of this study, elementary school meant those schools listed in the, "Official Directory of the Board of Education of the City of New York 1968-1969" which included grades K-6. In addition, those schools which have the prefix "Pre" before K-6 were included.

Using the definition above, 457 elementary schools were identified. There were 189 special service schools selected and 268 non-special service schools selected. Each of the 5 boroughs were represented as well as each of the 31 districts within the City. In order to insure that schools were located within current district lines, reference was made to, "District Organization Lines under the Community School District System - December 22, 1969."

At this point, each school was given a code number. Using the table of random numbers, a twenty per cent sample of schools was selected from each of the districts. Care was taken to insure the representativeness of special service schools and non-special service schools. Special service schools are those which receive additional supervisory and staff personnel and services because of such factors as: pupil mobility, staff turnover, and the economic status of the pupil population. Of the 457 schools which met our definition, 92 randomly selected schools were chosen.

A further separation of the sample population was necessary. The operational definition for inner city elementary schools is, "those elementary schools eligible for and receiving ESEA Title I assistance." This group, then, is our experimental group. Conversely, our control group consists of those elementary schools which are not eligible for nor receiving ESEA Title I assistance.

A list of ESEA Title I schools was published by the Board of Education of the City of New York and attached to, "Special Circular Number 90, 1969-1970." Schools were identified using this special circular which emanated from the Office of Personnel. There were 77 experimental schools and 15 control schools.

In addition to the categories of personnel mentioned above, included in our population was a one hundred per cent sample of district superintendents numbering 31 and a one hundred per cent sample of members of the Board of Education numbering five.

In order to secure the names of professors of educational administration, we contacted the, "Advisory Council of Colleges and Universities in Teacher Education." Of the 32 universities contacted by telephone, 14 had courses in educational administration. Of these, 13 responded, identifying the staff who teach courses in educational administration. There were 100 names in all.

Still another source for our population sample were Community Corporation and Planning Committees, the Council Against Poverty, and the Model Cities Program. We identified the directors, chairmen, education committee representatives, local education committee chairmen, and local education staff directors. The total number of personnel selected was 75. The areas represented were:

Manhattan
Middle East Side, Upper West Side, Mid West Side, Lower West Side, Lower East Side, Central Harlem, East Harlem,

Bronx
Morrisania, South Bronx, Hunts Point, Tremont, Bronx River,

Kings
East New York, Sunset Park, Williamsburg, Fort Greene, South Brooklyn, Bushwick, Brownsville, Bedford Stuyvesant, Coney Island, Crown Heights,

Queens
Long Island City, Rockaway, Jamaica, Corona-East Elmhurst,

Richmond
Model Cities Program

D. Selection of Personnel in Schools

In order to select the personnel in our school sample, it was necessary to obtain from each of the schools a list of all staff members. Lists are collected from the schools each year on April 15 by the Division of Personnel in the form of a report called, "Report on Personnel." The list contains the name, license and position of every member of the school staff. Listed were the principal, assistant principals, school secretaries, teachers and others. We selected a one hundred per cent sample principals, assistant principals, and school secretaries. For teachers, however, other procedures were followed. We excluded from the, "Report on Personnel,"the following categories of persons listed as teachers: substitutes, those on leaves of absence for various reasons, those assigned to other offices, guidance counselors, and per diem personnel. We then selected every third person from the remaining list. There were 92 principals selected, 146 assistant principals, 161 school secretaries, and 1,406 teachers.

In addition to staff personnel, it was necessary to secure the names of newly elected officers of the Parents Associations for the school year 1970-1971 for each of the schools under consideration. A letter was sent to each school on May 25, 1970 requesting the name of the president, vice-president, secretary, and treasurer. (Please see a copy of this letter in the appendix). In certain cases the names of more than four officers were presented. We selected only the officers indicated in the letter. In other cases, there were less than four officers in a school. Second and third requests were sent to certain schools. Questionnaires were sent to 366 officers of Parents Associations.

In addition to principals, assistant principals, school secretaries, teachers, and officers of Parents Associations, we selected community school board members by district. They numbered 279. The source for the community school board members was, "Community School Board Members, May 1970," and "Community School Board Members Manhattan, June 1970," both published by the Board of Education of the City of New York.

E. Instrument Development

In accordance with the proposal, the questionnaire was designed to elicit responses to two basic areas:

1. The professional characteristics of successful inner city elementary school principals.

2. The personal characteristics of successful inner city elementary school principals.

To avoid the limitations inherent in the closed questionnaire (restricted responses depended upon the researcher's predetermined selection), it was decided to use an open-ended format.

In addition to the two free response questions described in the proposal, it was decided to develop a series of short-answer questions to be included in the questionnaire. The researcher reviewed the "Duties of an Elementary School Principal." (See appendix.) This document is a job analysis of the elementary school principal. It was developed by the Superintendent of Schools, now called the Chancellor, and circulated to applicants for the position by the Board of Examiners. The list of duties was submitted to thirty-seven elementary school teachers and nine elementary school supervisors. The supervisors consisted of principals and assistant principals. Both groups were asked to select from the list the fifteen most important duties. These duties were ranked in order of choice. In addition to ranking the fifteen important duties of the elementary school principal, the thirty-seven teachers were asked to rank the five duties which they considered to be most important. As a result of this rank ordering of duties, twenty short answer questions were developed emphasizing those duties which were considered most important.

The draft of the questionnaire was submitted to thirty-seven elementary school teachers. A discussion period followed in which criticisms and suggestions for improving the questionnaire were made. After revision of the individual items and the format, the questionnaire was submitted to two consultants for evaluation and further suggestions. The consultants were Dr. Joseph Justman, Director, Institute for Research and Development, Fordham University; and Dr. Nathan Jaspen, Chairman, Department of Educational Statistics, New York University.

The final revised questionnaire will be found in the Appendix. The questionnaire printed on white paper was used with our experimental population. The questionnaire printed on green paper was used with our control population. In addition, cover letters were developed. It should be noted that a special letter was developed for use with our parent population. A Spanish translation of the cover letter and questionnaire was printed in order to accommodate our Spanish speaking population.

A series of four follow-up letters were developed to encourage returns. In each case, a follow-up letter, an additional questionnaire, and a stamped and addressed envelope was mailed. Telephone calls were made to encourage response from those individuals who did not respond to the follow-up letters. In each case, the respondent was assured of confidentiality.

The respondents were asked for identification data which included name, address, and school affiliation. In addition they were asked to indicate their position by checking one of the following ten positions:

1. District Superintendent
2. Principal
3. Assistant Principal
4. Teacher
5. School Secretary
6. Professor of Educational Administration
7. Board of Education Member
8. Community School Board Member
9. Parent Organization Member
10. Community Corporation Member

They were then asked to respond to 20 short-answer questions which described possible functions of an elementary school principal by checking the following numerical values.

1 - absolutely must
2 - preferably should
3 - may or may not
4 - preferably should not
5 - absolutely must not

The respondents were then asked to list by number, in descending order of importance, the five functions which they considered to be most important from the list of 20 to which they had already responded. Finally, the respondents were asked to respond to two free-response questio :

1. If you were selecting a principal for your school, what ive personal characteristics would you consider most important?

2. If you were selecting a principal for your school, what five professional experiences and characteristics would you consider most important?

F. Techniques Used for Analysis of Data

The respondents to the questionnaire were categorized in two basic ways; 1) by position or personnel stratum, and 2) by category type (Title I schools were the experimental group, non-Title I schools were the control group).

All persons identified in one of the 10 positions listed in E above who were associated with Title I or inner city schools received white questionnaires. They constituted the experimental group. All persons in the 10 positions who were associated with non-Title I schools received green questionnaires. They comprised the control group. Each questionnaire was identified by personnel stratum 1 through 10, by category type experimental or control, and by individual identification number.

1. Questions 1 through 20

Questions 1 through 20 are closed items with a 1 through 5 rating scale response. For each of the 20 items the data was analysed by sub-strata of personnel and by category. Chi-Square technique was used to determine if there were significant differences between the experimental and control groups and between the personnel strata.

1. Questions 1 through 20

Questions 1 through 20 are closed items with a 1 through 5 rating scale response. For each of the 20 items the data were analyzed by sub-strata of personnel and by category. Chi-Square technique was used to determine if there were significant differences between the experimental and control groups and between the personnel strata.

On the bottom of page 2 of the questionnaire the respondents were asked to list by number in descending order five of the twenty functions which they considered to be most important. The rank-difference coefficient of correlation (Spearman Rho) was used to examine the difference between personnel strata and between the categories. There were 315 Chi-Square tables and 21 Spearman Rho tables prepared which analyzed questions 1 through 20. These tables are currently available and may be examined upon request from the principal investigator. They were not, however, discussed and interpreted textually for two reasons. There were no references to items 1 through 20 in the original proposal. These items were developed and included at a later date.*

2. Questions 21 and 22

Content analysis was used to analyze the two free-response questions. After a preliminary reading, a ten per cent stratified random sample of returns was selected in order to develop specific and well-defined categories of response. To insure rater reliability the sample of returns was analyzed independently by two researchers. For each question, the written responses were recorded on index cards and then grouped into categories. There were nineteen categories developed for question 21 and fourteen categories developed for question 22. Descriptive headings were developed which reflected the responses in each of the categories. The somewhat repetitive material which follows each category heading is, in most cases, a direct quotation from the respondents. In some instances, however, paraphrasing was utilized to avoid unnecessary duplication.

It should be noted that there was a great deal of overlapping of responses to the questions under consideration. For example, although question 21 refers to personal characteristics, the participants noted, in addition to personal traits, many professional characteristics. Conversely, they listed many personal traits when answering the question concerning professional characteristics. No attempt was made, however, to transpose these responses. It was felt that responses should be reported as recorded. The following headings, therefore, will be found under both questions: human relations, staff relations, child oriented, parents and community, administration and supervision, dedication, innovation, charisma, and teaching skills and experience.

The responses to question 21 were categorized as follows:

* At present, there is insufficient secrtarial assistance available for this portion of the report to be prepared. It is hoped, however, that time and personnel will be made available so that this section may be presented in a supplemental report at a later date.

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 21

Question 21: If you were selecting a principal for your school, what five personal characteristics would you consider most important?

Category	Responses
1	HUMAN RELATIONS (Relates well with others, interested, understanding, trusts people, respect for fellow man, concern for welfare of others, gives and accepts love, rapport with all groups, works well with others, loves humanity, humanist, diplomacy, genuinely friendly, sensitivity, supportive, accessible, approachable, listens, sincerity, tactful, helpful, considerate, cooperative, sympathy, compassionate, perceptive, aware, responsive, empathetic, concern, affection, kind, accepting, warm, unselfish, etc.)
2	FAIR MINDED (Objective, impartial, open to discussion, not judgmental, fair play. fairness in dealing with all, nonprejudiced, integrationist, tolerant, free from bias, accepts all without regard to race and creed, open minded, flexible, etc.)
3	STAFF RELATIONS (Professional treatment of staff, works with, considers classroom teachers' needs, encourages, consideration, patience with, understanding problems of, sympathetic interest, aid, inspires, motivates, consults with, praises efforts of, maintains high teacher morale, aware of teachers' problems, supports staff, imparts confidence, helpful, etc.)
4	INTEGRITY (Principled, character, courage, withstands pressure, can't be bought off, ethics, convictions, respectability, high morals, fearless, faces reality, honest, etc.)
5	GOOD HUMORED (Sense of humor, pleasant, smiling, social understanding, optimistic, cheerful, enthusiastic, self-confident, outgoing, positive attitude, personable, extravert, self-respect, well mannered, poised, social ease, social grace, etc.)
6	CHILD ORIENTED (Aware of needs of, interest in, concern for, love, respect, patience with, understanding of, likes, involved with, encourages, appreciates differences among children, dedication to welfare of children, etc.)
7	SCHOLARSHIP (Intelligence, research oriented, learned, outstanding educational background, curriculum expert, educational philosophy, humanities, inquiring, world affairs, academic awareness, book knowledge, well read, programs, diversified interests, etc.)
8	PARENTS AND COMMUNITY (Communicates with, relates to, understands needs of, knowledge of different ethnic and socio-economic groups, knowledge of living conditions, leader of, involved with aspiration and needs of less educated, compassion for, interest in, patience with, empathy with, respect for, includes parents in school planning, does not bow to pressure, deals with community pressures, etc.)

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 21 (continued)

Category	Responses
9	DECISION MAKING (Establishes priorities, decisive, resolves conflicts, conciliates, compromises, functions well in ambiguous situations, contends with disparate points of view, follows through, carries out plans, sticks to decisions, common sense, reasonable, good judgment, foresightedness, initiative, perseveres, etc.)
10	ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION (Organizational skills, obtains equipment, knows procedures, competence, runs school smoothly, helpful to teachers, gives demonstration lessons, suggests, concern for new appointees, delegates responsibility, etc.)
11	EMOTIONAL STABILITY (Well organized, well integrated, stable mind, responsible, patient, calm, self-control, poised, maturity, consistency, mental health, emotional health, resiliency, etc.)
12	DEDICATION (To teaching, concern for improving education of children, to job, industrious, drive, striving, hard worker, conscientious, personal commitment, works before and after hours, patriotism, etc.)
13	PERSONAL APPEARANCE AND HEALTH (Neat, well groomed, pleasant, clean, energy, vigor, physical well being, etc.)
14	INNOVATIVE (Adventurous, open to new ideas, new approaches to teaching, original point of view, not traditional, inventive, imaginative, creative, resourceful, progressive, adaptable, initiative, diversified interests, open to change, etc.)
15	HUMILITY (Modesty, lack of snobbishness, accepts criticism, admits mistakes, desires to improve, receptive to suggestions, etc.)
16	AUTHORITATIVE (Firm, good disciplinarian, forceful but not dictatorial, firm but not obstinate, etc.)
17	CHARISMA (Inspirational, inspires confidence, commands respect, leadership, dynamic, sets a climate for learning, etc.)
18	COMMUNICATION SKILLS (Good speaker, expresses self well, communicates with children as well as adults, public relations, articulate, ability to handle groups, etc.)
19	TEACHING SKILL AND EXPERIENCE (Competence, ability, extensive classroom experience, excellent classroom techniques, etc.)

The responses to question 22 were categorized as follows:

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 22

Question 22: If you were selecting a principal for your school, what five professional experiences and characteristics would you consider most important?

Category	Responses
1	ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION (Experience and training in supervision; develops teacher training programs; hires superior teachers; participates in internship programs; experience as assistant principal or other intermediate supervisory position; business management experience; ability to plan, organize, and run a school; curriculum planning and development experience; guidance experience; uses team approach; delegates authority; etc.)
2	TEACHING SKILL AND EXPERIENCE (Has experience on a variety of levels, elementary experience, junior high school experience, high school experience, recent teaching experience, a master teacher who frequently gives demonstration lessons, etc.)
3	EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND (Doctorate degree; master's degree; ability to pass a merit examination; New York State certificate; must have courses and ability in the following areas: human relations, business, literature, administration and supervision, group dynamics, foreign language, subject matter specialty, psychology, guidance, public relations, curriculum development; shows evidence of scholarship; continues taking courses; etc.)
4	PARENTS AND COMMUNITY (Establishes liaison with community, participates in civic matters, experience in the community, utilizes public agencies and community resources, sympathetic toward community, respects parents, encourages parent associations, ability to work with adults, listens to parents, etc.)
5	INNOVATION AND EVALUATION (Establishes experimental and educational programs, encourages staff to initiate programs, reviews innovations in curriculum, develops new programs in response to pupil and teacher individual differences, is evaluation oriented, uses modern evaluation techniques to judge the effectiveness of new programs, etc.)
6	STAFF RELATIONS (Establishes work shops for staff, is supportive of staff, accepts staff suggestions, is respected by staff, values staff, cooperates with staff, is sympathetic toward the union, knows staff members well, willingly helps staff, maintains a professional attitude toward staff, is loyal toward staff, etc.)
7	PERSONAL CHARACTER (Is self-assured, respectable, honest, ethical, has integrity, patient, hopeful, understanding, flexible, sense of humor, learns from past experience, ability to withstand pressure, able to face crises, makes unpopular decisions when necessary, remains calm, etc.)
8	HUMAN RELATIONS (Unbiased, objective, open-minded, fair, impartial, sensitive, democratic, firm, consistent, relates well with adults, reconciles different viewpoints, etc.)

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 22 (continued)

Category	Responses
9	CHILD ORIENTED (Establishes rapport with children, loves children, maintains contacts with children, utilizes principles of child development, varies curriculum to meet individual needs of children, etc.)
10	DEDICATION (Values public education, sense of direction and purpose, has pride in school program, has a personal educational philosophy, an on-going interest in the problems and aims of education, etc.)
11	INTELLIGENCE (Identifies problems, thinks independently, has an inquiring mind, etc.)
12	CHARISMA (Arouses enthusiasm in children, staff, parents and community; leadership qualities; inspires others; etc.)
13	PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES (Participates in professional organizations, works on committees, is active in learned societies, continues his professional development, etc.)
14	VARIED BACKGROUND (Has varied experiences, widely traveled, broad background, cosmopolitan, has interdisciplinary experiences and interest, etc.)

Quantitative results in the form of numerical frequencies for each of the categories were converted into rank order schema for each of the sub-strata in the population sample. The rank-difference coefficient of correlation (Spearman Rho) was used to examine the differences between category rank order assigned by each sub-stratum.

In addition to analysis by personnel sub-strata in the population sample, an analysis of the data was made by community or district approach (experimental vs. control). In this case, the responses from all the listed personnel within the experimental group (Title I schools) was combined and then compared with the responses from personnel in the control group (non-Title I schools). It was hoped that these data would support or reject the situational approach to the conceptualization of educational leadership. Do the different communities within the City of New York perceive the "successful" elementary school principal with the same set? Does each community perceive the "successful" elementary school principal uniquely?

In addition to analyzing the data by personnel sub-strata and by category, it was necessary to combine strata in order to view the totality of responses. The combined rank order permits an over-view of that which may be conceived as the common characteristics of successful elementary school principals.

The Institute for Research and Evaluation at Fordham University, New York City, provided the data processing service for this project. They provided key punching and verification of one card for each returned questionnaire. The data punched were:

a. Identification number
b. Stratumidentification
c. Category identification (experimental or control)
d. Responses to twenty items
e. Rank order list of five functions
f. Coded responses to item 21
g. Coded responses to item 22

They provided tabulations of distributions of responses for each item for each of the ten strata of personnel for the experimental, control, and total groups.

Chapter III will present the findings.

CHAPTER III

THE FINDINGS

I Population Response

In the Spring of 1970 two thousand six hundred twenty-six (2,626) questionnaires were sent to our sample population. Of these, one thousand four hundred and eighty-two (1,482) were returned. This represents a fifty-six per cent return. Table I indicates the number of questionnaires sent and returned and the per cent of return by personnel strata.

Table I

Number of Questionnaires Sent and Returned, and Per Cent of Return by Personnel Strata

Personnel Strata	N Sent	N Returned	Per Cent Returned
District Superintendent	31	23	.74
Principal	92	79	.86
Assistant Principal	147	115	.78
Teacher	1365	787	.58
School Secretary	162	107	.66
Professor of Educational Administration	102	62	.61
Board of Education Member *	7	3	.43
Community School Board Member	279	124	.44
Parent Organization Member	366	160	.44
Community Corporation Member	75	22	.29
Total	2626	1482	.56

*This stratum includes the five members of the Board of Education, the Chancellor, and the Deputy Chancellor.

It is interesting to note that the six personnel groups which returned more than fifty per cent of the questionnaires were described on page eight as the professional educators (District Superintendent, Principal, Assistant Principal, Teacher, School Secretary, and Professor of Educational Administration) in our sample. The four groups which returned less than fifty per cent of the questionnaires were described as community representatives. They included Community School Board Members, Parent Organization Members, Board of Education Members, and Community Corporation Members. It should be remembered, however, that the Board of Education stratum included, in addition to the five members of the Board, the Chancellor and the Deputy Chancellor. With these two exceptions, all persons included in those strata may be described as lay persons or members of the community rather than school or professional personnel.

There were a number of persons who could not be expected to return the questionnaires. They included twenty persons who resigned from the school system, twenty who transferred to other schools within the system which were not in our sample, seventeen who took leaves of absence, twelve who retired, and one who was deceased. They numbered seventy-eight in all. If we subtract this number from our total population, our per cent of response would be somewhat higher; fifty-eight per cent rather than fifty-six per cent. In addition, thirty-nine persons in the experimental group and seven in the control group indicated either by letter or in response to a telephone follow-up that they did not wish to participate for various reasons.

There were two thousand two hundred and seventy-nine (2,279) questionnaires sent to the experimental group and one thousand two hundred and sixty-eight (1,268) returned. This represents a fifty-six per cent return. Returns were somewhat better for the control group. There were three hundred forty-seven (347) questionnaires sent and two hundred fourteen (214) returned. This represents a sixty-two per cent return.

It should be remembered that our experimental group constitutes persons connected with ESEA Title I schools. These schools are defined as inner-city elementary schools. The eligibility criteria for their selection were approved by the Board of Education of the City of New York at a public hearing on August 28, 1969. The criteria were set in accordance with State and Federal guidelines which intended that ESEA funds and services be concentrated in the neediest schools. They are located in poverty areas as designated by the Council Against Poverty. Thirty per cent or more of the pupils are eligible for free lunch. Academic retardation is also taken into consideration. The median score for reading in these schools is one year or more below the national norm in grade five. There were seventy-seven Title I or inner-city schools in our experimental population. There were fifteen non-Title I schools in our control population which were randomly selected from the list of non-Title I schools in the city.

II Responses to Question 21

It will be remembered that questions twenty-one was a free response question in which the respondents were asked: "If you were selecting a principal for your school, what five personal characteristics would you consider most important?" The responses were analyzed using content analysis technique and then ranked in order of frequency by personnel strata and by experimental and control groups. There were nineteen categories developed for question twenty-one. The category headings and direct quotations from the respondents are listed on pages fourteen and fifteen. The headings were as follows:

1. Human Relations
2. Fair Minded
3. Staff Relations
4. Integrity
5. Good Humored
6. Child Oriented
7. Scholarship
8. Parents and Community
9. Decision Making
10. Administration and Supervision
11. Emotional Stability
12. Dedication
13. Personal Appearance and Health
14. Innovative
15. Humility
16. Authoritative
17. Charisma
18. Communication Skills
19. Teaching Skill and Experience

For the purpose of analysis certain personnel strata were grouped together. This decision was made because the N was small for the individual groups and because they were closely identified with one another. Strata one, two, and three (District Superintendent, Principal, and Assistant Principal) were combined and are identified as Administrators. Strata eight and ten (Community School Board Members and Community Corporation Members) were combined and are identified as Community Representatives.

For the purpose of analysis certain personnel strata were grouped together. This decision was made because the n was small for the individual groups and because they were closely identified with one another. Strata one, two, and three (District Superintendent, Principal,and Assistant Principal) were combined and are identified as Administrators. Strata eight and ten (Community School Board Members and Community Corporation Members) were combined and are identified as Community Representatives.

To analyze the data, we used the rank correlation coefficient which is a measure of the degree of relationship between two sets of ranks. A correlation coefficient may range in value from -1.0 to 1.0; the former indicating the perfect negative relationship, the latter a perfect positive relationship. In the absence of any relationship between the two sets of ranks, the value of rho is zero. It will be remembered that we posed the null hypothesis for this study. The null hypothesis would be supported when the population correlation is zero or not significantly different from zero. Since either negative or positive values of rho will provide evidence against this hypothesis, we have used a two-tailed test of significance. We utilized Edwards [21] Appendix Table VI, "Values of the Correlation Coefficient for Different Levels of Significance." This table enables the investigator to evaluate the correlation coefficient directly, without the necessity of computing t. The table permits the test of the null hypothesis of zero correlation when n is greater than 10. The table is entered with the degree of freedom equal to n-2.

The categories which have been ranked by our personnel groups have no known previously established intrinsic order. In each case, two groups have ranked the categories with respect to their frequency and the rank correlation coefficient between the two sets of ranks was then computed. The value of rho is a measure of the degree of agreement between groups. We are merely testing, therefore, the degree of agreement between the ranks assigned by our groups.

A high value of rho indicates that the groups are applying essentially the same standards to the categories being ranked, regardless of other considerations. Such a finding is of considerable importance when no external criterion of order for the categories is available. When investigating the relative merits of a set of categories in terms of some attributes for which we have no direct measure, we are dealing essentially with opinions and value judgments. If an objective order of merit were possible for the categories, we could test the judgments of each rater against this objective by means of rank correlation coefficient. We would, in essence, be testing the ability of the rater to judge in accordance with an imposed objective standard. But in the absence of an objective order, we can rely only upon the community of agreement among our groups as a means of establishing an order. In certain of the tables to follow, there are instances of tied ranks. A correction factor was considered but not utilized, for as Edwards points out, the value of the rank correlation coefficient obtained with the correction factor for ties differs but little from that obtained without taking the tied ranks into account.[22]

21 Allen Edwards, Statistical Methods for the Behavioral Sciences, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, 1962.

22 Ibid. pp. 399-429.

Table 2 presents rank order correlations between the experimental and control groups.

TABLE 2

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS

BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

QUESTION 21

Position	Correlation
1. Total Experimental vs .Total Control	.957*
2. Administrators - Experimental vs.Control	.908*
3. Teachers - Experimental vs.Control	.943*
4. Secretaries - Experimental vs.Control	.762*
5. Community Boards - Experimental vs.Control	.932*
6. Parents - Experimental vs.Control	.697*

* Significant at .01 level
df = 17

When we compared the total experimental with the total control group the correlation obtained was significant at the .01 level. Similarly, when we compared the experimental with the control group of administrators, teachers, secretaries, community boards, and parents the correlations obtained were significant at the .01 level. We are, at this point, able to reject the null hypothesis insofar as the personal characteristics of principals are concerned. In only one case out of one hundred was it possible that the level of significance reached was due to chance. It is safe to say, then that both our professional and lay populations connected with inner city schools (Title I Schools) evidenced a high degree of agreement with the professional and lay population connected with the non-inner city schools (non-Title I Schools). There is a high degree of agreement between these groups in ranking the personal characteristics of principals.

It should be noted that two personnel groups were not included in Table 2. Board of Education Members and Professors of Educational Administration were deleted from these comparisons because they do not relate exclusively with either Title I or non-Title I schools. These personnel groups relate to both types of schools.

It is important to examine these correlations more closely. Table 3 presents the total response and the rank order of response to question 21 by the total experimental and control groups.

Table 3

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Total Experimental vs. Total Control

Category	Total Response	Total Rank	Response Exp.	Response Cont.	Rank Exp.	Rank Cont.	D	D^2
1	1,458	1	1,245	213	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	460	4	387	73	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.00
3	278	11	229	49	11.0	7.0	4.0	16.00
4	622	3	537	85	2.5	3.0	0.5	0.25
5	424	5	361	63	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.00
6	320	7	275	45	7.0	8.0	1.0	1.00
7	390	6	334	56	6.0	6.0	0.0	0.00
8	261	12	223	38	12.0	10.5	1.5	2.25
9	201	14	179	22	14.0	16.5	2.5	6.25
10	252	13	222	30	13.0	13.0	0.0	0.00
11	297	9	259	38	9.0	10.5	1.5	2.25
12	295	10	263	32	8.0	12.0	4.0	16.00
13	199	15	175	24	15.0	15.0	0.0	0.00
14	626	2	537	89	2.5	2.0	0.5	0.25
15	78	19	69	7	19.0	19.0	0.0	0.00
16	142	17	120	22	17.0	16.5	0.5	0.25
17	301	8	257	44	10.0	9.0	1.0	1.00
18	179	16	152	27	16.0	14.0	2.0	4.00
19	122	18	108	14	18.0	18.0	0.0	0.00

$\Sigma D^2 = 49.50$
$r = .957$
$df = 17$
Significant at .01

The correlation of .957 was significant at the .01 level. Table 3 presents the total rank order of categories when the groups were combined in addition to separate rank orders for the experimental and control groups. The five most frequently noted categories in rank order were: Human Relations, Innovation, Integrity, Fair Minded, and Good Humored. Descriptions of these category headings, in the language of the respondents, will be found on pages fourteen and fifteen.

Table 4 presents the total response and the rank order of response of administrators, both experimental and control.

Table 4

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Administrators
Experimental vs.Control

Category	Total Response	Total Rank	Response Exp.	Response Cont.	Rank Exp.	Rank Cont.	D	D^2
1	253	1	219	34	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	45	9	40	5	9.0	8.0	1.0	1.00
3	13	17	12	1	16.5	17.0	0.5	0.25
4	93	3	85	8	3.0	6.0	3.0	9.00
5	56	6	43	13	8.0	3.0	5.0	25.00
6	34	11	31	3	11.0	13.0	2.0	4.00
7	83	4	73	10	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.00
8	18	15	16	2	15.0	15.5	0.5	0.25
9	29	13	26	3	13.0	13.0	0.0	0.00
10	38	10	35	3	10.0	13.0	3.0	9.00
11	48	8	44	4	6.5	10.5	4.0	16.00
12	53	7	44	9	6.5	5.0	1.5	2.25
13	32	12	27	5	12.0	8.0	4.0	16.00
14	120	2	104	16	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.00
15	9	18	9	0	18.0	18.5	0.5	0.25
16	3	19	3	0	19.0	18.5	0.5	0.25
17	57	5	52	5	5.0	8.0	3.0	9.00
18	27	14	23	4	14.0	10.5	3.5	12.25
19	14	16	12	2	16.5	15.5	1.0	1.00

$\sum D^2 = 105.5$

$r = .908$

df = 17
Significant at .01

The correlation of .908 was significant at the .01 level. When we combine total rank order of response for administrators, the five most frequently noted categories in rank order were: Human Relations, Innovation, Integrity, Scholarship, and Charisma Descriptions of these category headings will be found on pages fourteen and fifteen

Table 5 presents the total response and the rank order of response of experimental and control teachers.

Table 5

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Teachers
Experimental vs .Control

Category	Total Response	Total Rank	Response Exp.	Response Cont.	Rank Exp.	Rank Cont.	D	D^2
1	759	1	652	107	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	296	3	239	57	4.0	2.0	2.0	4.00
3	220	6	178	42	5.0	4.0	1.0	2.00
4	285	4	247	38	3.0	5.0	2.0	4.00
5	234	5	202	32	6.0	6.0	0.0	0.00
6	168	8	146	22	7.5	9.5	2.0	4.00
7	177	7	146	31	7.5	7.0	0.5	0.25
8	146	12	124	22	12.0	9.5	2.5	6.25
9	120	14	107	13	14.0	14.0	0.0	0.00
10	139	13	123	16	13.0	12.0	1.0	1.00
11	162	9	141	21	9.0	11.0	2.0	4.00
12	150	11	138	12	10.0	15.0	5.0	25.00
13	80	17	69	11	17.0	17.0	0.0	0.00
14	321	2	277	44	2.0	3.0	1.0	1.00
15	49	19	42	7	19.0	18.5	0.5	0.25
16	90	16	77	13	16.0	16.0	0.0	0.00
17	161	10	135	26	11.0	8.0	3.0	9.00
18	99	15	84	15	15.0	13.0	2.0	4.00
19	50	18	43	7	18.0	18.5	0.5	0.25

$\sum D^2 = 65.00$
$r = .943$
$df = 17$
Significant at .01

The obtained correlation of .943 was significant at the .01 level. When we combine the total rank order of response for teachers, the five most frequently noted categories in rank order were: Human Relations, Innovation, Fair Minded, Integrity, and Good Humored. These categories headings are described, in the language of the respondents, on pages fourteen and fifteen.

Table 6 presents the total response and the rank order of response for experimental and control secretaries.

Table 6

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Secretaries

Experimental vs. Control

Category	Total Response	Total Rank	Response Exp.	Response Cont.	Rank Exp.	Rank Cont.	D	D^2
1	123	1.0	101	22	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	49	3.0	43	6	2.0	4.5	2.5	6.25
3	15	14.5	12	3	15.0	9.5	5.5	30.25
4	53	2.0	40	13	3.0	2.0	1.0	1.00
5	37	5.0	30	7	5.0	3.0	2.0	4.00
6	19	9.0	18	1	8.5	16.5	8.0	64.00
7	23	8.0	21	2	7.0	12.5	5.5	30.25
8	11	16.5	10	1	16.5	16.5	0.0	0.00
9	15	14.5	14	1	12.0	16.5	4.5	20.25
10	27	6.0	23	4	6.0	7.5	1.5	2.25
11	24	7.0	18	6	8.5	4.5	4.0	16.00
12	16	12.0	14	2	12.0	12.5	0.5	0.25
13	18	10.0	14	4	12.0	7.5	4.5	20.25
14	38	4.0	33	5	4.0	6.0	2.0	4.00
15	4	19.0	4	0	19.0	19.0	0.0	0.00
16	16	12.0	14	2	12.0	12.5	0.5	0.25
17	16	12.0	14	2	12.0	12.5	0.5	0.25
18	8	18.0	5	3	18.0	9.5	8.5	72.25
19	11	16.5	10	1	16.5	16.5	0.0	0.00

$\Sigma D^2 = 271.5$

$r = .762$

$df = 17$

Significant at .01

The obtained correlation of .762 reached significance at the .01 level. When we combine the total rank order of response for secretaries, the five most frequently noted categories in rank order were: Human Relations, Integrity, Fair Minded, Innovation, and Good Humored.

Table 7 presents the total response and the rank order of response of experimental and control Community School Boards and Community Corporations.

Table 7

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Community Boards

Experimental vs. Control

Category	Total Response	Total Rank	Response Exp.	Response Cont.	Rank Exp.	Rank Cont.	D	D^2
1	113	1.0	98	15	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	22	13.0	19	3	13.0	11.5	1.5	2.25
3	14	16.0	13	1	16.0	15.5	0.5	0.25
4	84	2.0	72	12	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.00
5	30	9.0	24	6	9.0	5.5	3.5	12.25
6	27	10.0	22	5	10.5	8.5	2.0	4.00
7	50	4.0	44	6	4.0	5.5	1.5	2.25
8	40	6.0	34	6	6.0	5.5	0.5	0.25
9	11	17.0	10	1	17.0	15.5	1.5	2.25
10	23	11.5	20	3	12.0	11.5	0.5	0.25
11	23	11.5	22	1	10.5	15.5	5.0	25.00
12	42	5.0	36	6	5.0	5.5	0.5	0.25
13	20	14.0	18	2	14.0	13.0	1.0	1.00
14	63	3.0	54	9	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.00
15	5	19.0	5	0	19.0	18.5	0.5	0.25
16	10	18.0	9	1	18.0	15.5	2.5	6.25
17	33	7.5	28	5	8.0	8.5	0.5	0.25
18	16	15.0	16	0	15.0	18.5	3.5	12.25
19	33	7.5	29	4	7.0	10.0	3.0	9.00

$\Sigma D^2 = 78.000$

$r = .932$

$df = 17$

Significant at .01

The obtained correlation of .932 reached significance at the .01 level. When we combine the total rank order of response for community boards, the five most frequently noted categories in rank order were: Human Relations, Integrity, Innovation, Scholarship, and Dedication.

Table 8 presents the total response and the rank order of response of experimental and control parents.

Table 8

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Parents
Experimental vs.Control

Category	Total Response	Total Rank	Response Exp.	Response Cont.	Rank Exp.	Rank Cont.	D	D^2
1	128	1.0	35	93	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	41	5.5	2	39	16.0	4.0	12.0	144.00
3	15	16.0	2	13	16.0	15.0	1.0	1.00
4	76	2.0	14	62	3.5	2.0	1.5	2.25
5	35	7.0	5	30	10.5	8.0	2.5	6.25
6	59	3.0	14	45	3.5	3.0	0.5	0.25
7	32	9.0	7	25	5.5	9.5	4.0	16.00
8	41	5.5	7	34	5.5	6.0	0.5	0.25
9	13	17.0	4	9	12.5	18.0	5.5	30.25
10	16	15.0	4	12	12.5	16.0	3.5	12.25
11	31	10.0	6	25	8.0	9.5	1.5	2.25
12	18	14.0	3	15	14.0	13.0	1.0	1.00
13	33	8.0	2	31	16.0	7.0	9.0	81.00
14	53	4.0	15	38	2.0	5.0	3.0	9.00
15	6	19.0	0	6	18.5	19.0	0.5	0.25
16	22	12.0	6	16	8	12.0	4.0	16.00
17	26	11.0	6	20	8	11.0	3.0	9.00
18	19	13.0	5	14	10.5	14.0	3.5	12.25
19	11	18.0	0	11	18.5	17.0	1.5	2.25

$\Sigma D^2 = 345.5$
$r = .697$
$df = 17$
Significant at .01

The obtained correlation of .697 reached significance at the .01 level. When we combined the total rank order of response for parents, the five most frequently noted categories in rank order were: Human Relations, Integrity, Child Oriented, Innovation, and Parents and Community. Descriptions of these category headings, in the language of the respondents, will be found on pages fourteen and fifteen.

In Tables 2 through 8 the data were analyzed by Community or District approach (Experimental vs. Control). These tables enabled us to reject the situational approach to the conceptualization of educational leadership. We can say that the various communities within the City of New York have similar perceptions of the personal characteristics of the "successful" elementary principal.

Additional comparisons were made. The tables to follow analyze the data by total personnel sub-strata without regard to experimental or control groups. Table 9 presents the rank order correlations between total groups in each position.

Table 9

Rank Order Correlations

Between Total Groups in Each Position
Question 21

Position	Correlation
1. Administrators vs. Teachers	.757*
2. Administrators vs. Secretaries	.795*
3. Administrators vs. Professors	.836*
4. Administrators vs. Community Boards	.869*
5. Administrators vs. Parents	.671*
6. Teachers vs. Secretaries	.792*
7. Teachers vs. Professors	.558**
8. Teachers vs. Community Boards	.603*
9. Teachers vs. Parents	.734*
10. Secretaries vs. Professors	.665*
11. Secretaries vs. Community Boards	.549**
12. Secretaries vs. Parents	.621*
13. Professors vs. Community Boards	.640*
14. Professors vs. Parents	.614*
15. Community Boards vs. Parents	.624*

* Significant at .01 level
** Significant at .02 level
df = 17

Table 9 presents fifteen individual correlations which examine the relationship between personnel groups. It should be noted that one personnel group was not included in this table. Board of Education Members were deleted from these comparisons because the n (3) was not sufficient for meaningful interpretation. Thirteen of the comparisons were significant at the .01 level, two were significant at the .02 level. It can be concluded, therefore, that our personnel groups evidenced a high degree of agreement in ranking the personal characteristics of principals. The highest correlation in Table 9 was .869, the lowest was .549. This range of correlations is somewhat lower than the range of correlations comparing the experimental and control groups. Table 2 on page twenty-two reports a range of correlations from .957 to .697. We may say that there is a higher degree of agreement between our experimental and control groups by personnel strata than among total personnel strata. In each case, however, the correlations were sufficiently high to reject the null hypothesis of zero correlation. In other words, the various personnel groups view the personal characteristics of principals similarly.

The tables to follow (Tables 10-25) present the total response and the rank order of response of the fifteen comparisons noted in summary Table 9.

Table 10

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Administrators vs. Teachers

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Administrators	Teachers	Administrators	Teachers		
1	253	759	1	1	0	0
2	45	296	9	3	6	36
3	13	220	17	6	11	121
4	93	285	3	4	1	1
5	56	234	6	5	1	1
6	34	168	11	8	3	9
7	83	177	4	7	3	9
8	18	146	15	12	3	9
9	29	120	13	14	1	1
10	38	139	10	13	3	9
11	48	162	8	9	1	1
12	53	150	7	11	4	16
13	32	80	12	17	5	25
14	120	321	2	2	0	0
15	9	49	18	19	1	1
16	3	90	19	16	3	9
17	57	161	5	10	5	25
18	27	99	14	15	1	1
19	14	50	16	18	2	4

$\sum D^2 = 278.$

$r = .757$

df = 17

Significant at .01

Table 11

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Administrators vs. Secretaries

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Administrators	Secretaries	Administrators	Secretaries		
1	253	123	1	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	45	49	9	3.0	6.0	36.00
3	13	15	17	14.5	2.5	6.25
4	93	53	3	2.0	1.0	1.00
5	56	37	6	5.0	1.0	1.00
6	34	19	11	9.0	2.0	4.00
7	83	23	4	8.0	4.0	16.00
8	18	11	15	16.5	1.5	2.25
9	29	15	13	14.5	1.5	2.25
10	38	27	10	6.0	4.0	16.00
11	48	24	8	7.0	1.0	1.00
12	53	16	7	12.0	5.0	25.00
13	32	18	12	10.0	2.0	4.00
14	120	38	2	4.0	2.0	4.00
15	9	4	18	19.0	1.0	1.00
16	3	16	19	12.0	7.0	49.00
17	57	16	5	12.0	7.0	49.00
18	27	8	14	18.0	4.0	16.00
19	14	11	16	16.5	0.5	0.25

$\Sigma D^2 = 234$

r= .795

df = 17

Significant at .01

Table 12

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Administrators vs. Professors

Category	Response		Rank			
	Administrators	Professors	Administrators	Professors	D	D^2
1	253	64	1	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	45	7	9	14.0	5.0	25.00
3	13	1	17	18.5	1.5	2.25
4	93	31	3	3.5	0.5	0.25
5	56	32	6	2.0	4.0	16.00
6	34	13	11	8.5	2.5	6.25
7	83	25	4	5.0	1.0	1.00
8	18	5	15	15.0	0.0	0.00
9	29	13	13	8.5	4.5	20.25
10	38	9	10	12.0	2.0	4.00
11	48	12	8	10.0	2.0	4.00
12	53	16	7	6.5	0.5	0.25
13	32	16	12	6.5	5.5	30.25
14	120	31	2	3.5	1.5	2.25
15	9	3	18	16.5	1.5	2.25
16	3	1	19	18.5	0.5	0.25
17	57	8	5	13.0	8.0	64.00
18	27	10	14	11.0	3.0	9.00
19	14	3	16	16.5	0.5	0.25

$\Sigma D^2 = 187.5$

$r = .836$

$df = 17$

Significant at .01

Table 13

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Administrators vs Community Boards

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Administrators	Community	Administrators	Community		
1	253	113	1	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	45	22	9	13.0	4.0	16.00
3	13	14	17	16.0	1.0	1.00
4	93	84	3	2.0	1.0	1.00
5	56	30	6	9.0	3.0	9.00
6	34	27	11	10.0	1.0	1.00
7	83	50	4	4.0	0.0	0.00
8	18	40	5	6.0	1.0	1.00
9	29	11	13	17.0	4.0	16.00
10	38	23	10	11.5	1.5	2.25
11	48	23	8	11.5	3.5	12.25
12	53	42	7	5.0	2.0	4.00
13	32	20	12	14.0	2.0	4.00
14	120	63	2	3.0	1.0	1.00
15	9	5	18	19.0	1.0	1.00
16	3	10	19	18.0	1.0	1.00
17	57	33	5	7.5	2.5	6.25
18	27	16	14	15.0	1.0	1.00
19	14	33	16	7.5	8.5	72.25

$\Sigma D^2 = 150$

$r = .869$

df = 17

Significant at .01

Table 14

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Administrators vs .Parents

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Administrators	Parents	Administrators	Parents		
1	253	128	1	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	45	41	9	5.5	3.5	12.25
3	13	15	17	16.0	1.0	1.00
4	93	76	3	2.0	1.0	1.00
5	56	35	6	7.0	1.0	1.00
6	34	59	11	3.0	8.0	64.00
7	83	32	4	9.0	5.0	0.25
8	18	41	15	5.5	9.5	90.25
9	29	13	13	17.0	4.0	16.00
10	38	16	10	15.0	5.0	25.00
11	48	31	8	10.0	2.0	4.00
12	53	18	7	14.0	7.0	49.00
13	32	33	12	8.0	4.0	16.00
14	120	53	2	4.0	2.0	4.00
15	9	6	18	19.0	1.0	1.00
16	3	22	19	12.0	7.0	49.00
17	57	26	5	11.0	6.0	36.00
18	27	19	14	13.0	1.0	1.00
19	14	11	16	18.0	2.0	4.00

$\Sigma D^2 = 374.75$

r= .671

df = 17

Significant at .01

Table 15

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Teachers vs. Secretaries

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Teachers	Secretaries	Teachers	Secretaries		
1	759	123	1	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	296	49	3	3.0	0.0	0.00
3	220	15	6	14.5	8.5	72.25
4	285	53	4	2.0	2.0	4.00
5	234	37	5	5.0	0.0	0.00
6	168	19	8	9.0	1.0	1.00
7	177	23	7	8.0	1.0	1.00
8	146	11	12	16.5	4.5	20.25
9	120	15	14	14.5	0.5	0.25
10	139	27	13	6.0	7.0	49.00
11	162	24	9	7.0	2.0	4.00
12	150	16	11	12.0	1.0	1.00
13	80	18	17	10.0	7.0	49.00
14	321	38	2	4.0	2.0	4.00
15	49	4	19	19.0	0.0	0.00
16	90	16	16	12.0	4.0	16.00
17	161	16	10	12.0	2.0	4.00
18	99	8	15	18.0	3.0	9.00
19	50	11	18	16.5	1.5	2.25

$\Sigma D^2 = 237$

r = .792

df = 17

Significant at .01

Table 16

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Teachers vs. Professors

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Teachers	Professors	Teachers	Professors		
1	759	64	1	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	296	7	3	14.0	11.0	121.00
3	220	1	6	18.5	12.5	156.25
4	285	31	4	3.5	0.5	0.25
5	234	32	5	2.0	3.0	9.00
6	168	13	8	8.5	0.5	0.25
7	177	25	7	5.0	2.0	4.00
8	146	5	12	15.0	3.0	9.00
9	120	13	14	8.5	5.5	30.25
10	139	9	13	12.0	1.0	1.00
11	162	12	9	10.0	1.0	1.00
12	150	16	11	6.5	4.5	20.25
13	80	16	17	6.5	10.5	110.25
14	321	31	2	3.5	1.5	2.25
15	49	3	19	16.5	2.5	6.25
16	90	1	16	18.5	2.5	6.25
17	161	8	10	13.0	3.0	9.00
18	99	10	15	11.0	4.0	16.00
19	50	3	18	16.5	1.5	2.25

$\Sigma D^2 = 504.5$

$r = .558$

df = 17

Significant at .02

Table 17

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Teachers vs. Community Boards

	Response		Rank			
Category	Teachers	Community	Teachers	Community	D	D^2
1	759	113	1	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	296	22	3	13.0	10.0	100.00
3	220	14	6	16.0	10.0	100.00
4	285	84	4	2.0	2.0	4.00
5	234	30	5	9.0	4.0	16.00
6	168	27	8	10.0	2.0	4.00
7	177	50	7	4.0	3.0	9.00
8	146	40	12	6.0	6.0	36.00
9	120	11	14	17.0	3.0	9.00
10	139	23	13	11.5	1.5	2.25
11	162	23	9	11.5	2.5	6.25
12	150	42	11	5.0	6.0	36.00
13	80	20	17	14.0	3.0	9.00
14	321	63	2	3.0	1.0	1.00
15	49	5	19	19.0	0.0	0.00
16	90	10	16	18.0	2.0	4.00
17	161	33	10	7.5	2.5	6.25
18	99	16	15	15.0	0.0	0.00
19	50	33	18	7.5	10.5	110.25

$\Sigma D^2 = 453.$

r= .603

df = 17

Significant at .01

Table 18

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Teachers vs. Parents

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Teachers	Parents	Teachers	Parents		
1	759	128	1	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	296	41	3	5.5	2.5	6.25
3	220	15	6	16.0	10.0	100.00
4	285	76	4	2.0	2.0	4.00
5	234	35	5	7.0	2.0	4.00
6	168	59	8	3.0	5.0	25.00
7	177	32	7	9.0	2.0	4.00
8	146	41	12	5.5	6.5	42.25
9	120	13	14	17.0	3.0	9.00
10	139	16	13	15.0	2.0	4.00
11	162	31	9	10.0	1.0	1.00
12	150	18	11	14.0	3.0	9.00
13	80	33	17	8.0	9.0	81.00
14	321	53	2	4.0	2.0	4.00
15	49	6	19	19.0	0.0	0.00
16	90	22	16	12.0	4.0	16.00
17	161	26	10	11.0	1.0	1.00
18	99	19	15	13.0	2.0	4.00
19	50	11	18.	18.0	0.0	0.00

$\Sigma D^2 = 314.5$

$r = .725$

$df = 17$

Significant at .01

Table 19

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Secretaries vs. Professors

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Secretaries	Professors	Secretaries	Professors		
1	123	64	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	49	7	3.0	14.0	11.0	121.00
3	15	1	14.5	18.5	4.0	16.00
4	53	31	2.0	3.5	1.5	2.25
5	37	32	5.0	2.0	3.0	9.00
6	19	13	9.0	8.5	0.5	0.25
7	23	25	8.0	5.0	3.0	9.00
8	11	5	16.5	15.0	1.5	2.25
9	15	13	14.5	8.5	6.0	36.00
10	27	9	6.0	12.0	6.0	36.00
11	24	12	7.0	10.0	3.0	9.00
12	16	16	12.0	6.5	5.5	30.25
13	18	16	10.0	6.5	3.5	12.25
14	38	31	4.0	3.5	0.5	0.25
15	4	3	19.0	16.5	2.5	6.25
16	16	1	12.0	18.5	6.5	42.25
17	16	8	12.0	13.0	1.0	1.00
18	8	10	18.0	11.0	7.0	49.00
19	11	3	16.5	16.5	0.0	0.00

$\Sigma D^2 = 382$

$r = .665$

$df = 17$

Significant at .01

Table 20.

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Secretaries vs Community Boards

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Secretaries	Community	Secretaries	Community		
1	123	113	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	49	22	3.0	13.0	10.0	100.00
3	15	14	14.5	16.0	1.5	2.25
4	53	84	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.00
5	37	30	5.0	9.0	4.0	16.00
6	19	27	9.0	10.0	1.0	1.00
7	23	50	8.0	4.0	4.0	16.00
8	11	40	16.5	6.0	10.5	110.25
9	15	11	14.5	17.0	2.5	6.25
10	27	23	6.0	11.5	5.5	30.25
11	24	23	7.0	11.5	4.5	20.25
12	16	42	12.0	5.0	7.0	49.00
13	18	20	10.0	14.0	4.0	16.00
14	38	63	4.0	3.0	1.0	1.00
15	4	5	19.0	19.0	0.0	0.00
16	16	10	12.0	18.0	6.0	36.00
17	16	33	12.0	7.5	4.5	20.25
18	8	16	18.0	15.0	3.0	9.00
19	11	33	16.5	7.5	9.0	81.00

$\Sigma D^2 = 514.5$

$r = .549$

$df = 17$

Significant at .02

Table 21

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Secretaries vs. Parents

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Secretaries	Parents	Secretaries	Parents		
1	123	128	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	49	41	3.0	5.5	2.5	6.25
3	15	15	14.5	16.0	1.5	2.25
4	53	76	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.00
5	37	35	5.0	7.0	2.0	4.00
6	19	59	9.0	3.0	6.0	36.00
7	23	32	8.0	9.0	1.0	1.00
8	11	41	16.5	5.5	11.0	121.00
9	15	13	14.5	17.0	2.5	6.25
10	27	16	6.0	15.0	9.0	81.00
11	24	31	7.0	10.0	3.0	9.00
12	16	18	12.0	14.0	2.0	4.00
13	18	33	10.0	8.0	2.0	4.00
14	38	53	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.00
15	4	6	19.0	19.0	0.0	0.00
16	16	22	12.0	12.0	0.0	0.00
17	16	26	12.0	11.0	1.0	1.00
18	8	19	18.0	13.0	5.0	25.00
19	11	11	16.5	18.0	1.5	2.25

$\Sigma D^2 = 303$

r = .734

df = 17

Significant at .01

Table 22

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Professors vs Community Boards

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Professors	Community	Professors	Community		
1	64	113	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	7	22	14.0	13.0	1.0	1.00
3	1	14	18.5	16.0	2.5	6.25
4	31	84	3.5	2.0	1.5	2.25
5	32	30	2.0	9.0	7.0	49.00
6	13	27	8.5	10.0	1.5	2.25
7	25	50	5.0	4.0	1.0	1.00
8	5	40	15.0	6.0	9.0	81.00
9	13	11	8.5	17.0	8.5	72.25
10	9	23	12.0	11.5	0.5	0.25
11	12	23	10.0	11.5	1.5	2.25
12	16	42	6.5	5.0	1.5	2.25
13	16	20	6.5	14.0	7.5	56.25
14	31	63	3.5	3.0	0.5	0.25
15	3	5	16.5	19.0	2.5	6.25
16	1	10	18.5	18.0	0.5	0.25
17	8	33	13.0	7.5	5.5	30.25
18	10	16	11.0	15.0	4.0	16.00
19	3	33	16.5	7.5	9.0	81.00

$\Sigma D^2 = 410.0$

$r = .640$

$df = 17$

Significant at .01

Table 23

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Professors vs Parents

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Professors	Parents	Professors	Parents		
1	64	128	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	7	41	14.0	5.5	8.5	72.25
3	1	15	18.5	16.0	2.5	6.25
4	31	76	3.5	2.0	1.5	2.25
5	32	35	2.0	7.0	5.0	25.00
6	13	59	8.5	3.0	5.5	30.25
7	25	32	5.0	9.0	4.0	16.00
8	5	41	15.0	5.5	9.5	90.25
9	13	13	8.5	17.0	8.5	72.25
10	9	16	12.0	15.0	3.0	9.00
11	12	31	10.0	10.0	0.0	0.00
12	16	18	6.5	14.0	7.5	56.25
13	16	33	6.5	8.0	1.5	2.25
14	31	53	3.5	4.0	0.5	0.25
15	3	6	16.5	19.0	2.5	6.25
16	1	22	18.5	12.0	6.5	42.25
17	8	26	13.0	11.0	2.0	4.00
18	10	19	11.0	13.0	2.0	4.00
19	3	11	16.5	18.0	1.5	2.25

$\sum D^2 = 441$

$r = .614$

df = 17

Significant at .01

Table 24

Rank Order of Response to Question 21, Personal Characteristics

Community Boards vs. Parents

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Community	Parents	Community	Parents		
1	113	128	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	22	41	13.0	5.5	7.5	56.25
3	14	15	16.0	16.0	0.0	0.00
4	84	76	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.00
5	30	35	9.0	7.0	2.0	4.00
6	27	59	10.0	3.0	7.0	49.00
7	50	32	4.0	9.0	5.0	25.00
8	40	41	6.0	5.5	0.5	0.25
9	11	13	17.0	17.0	0.0	0.00
10	23	16	11.5	15.0	3.5	12.25
11	23	31	11.5	10.0	1.5	2.25
12	42	18	5.0	14.0	9.0	81.00
13	20	33	14.0	8.0	6.0	36.00
14	63	53	3.0	4.0	1.0	1.00
15	5	6	19.0	19.0	0.0	0.00
16	10	22	18.0	12.0	6.0	36.00
17	33	26	7.5	11.0	3.5	12.25
18	16	19	15.0	13.0	2.0	4.00
19	33	11	7.5	18.0	10.5	110.25

$\Sigma D^2 = 429.5$

$r = .624$

df = 17

Significant at .01

III. Response to Question 22

It will be remembered that question twenty-two was a free response question which asked the respondents, "If you were selecting a principal for your school, what five professional experiences and characteristics would you consider most important?" The responses were analyzed using content analysis technique and then ranked in order of frequency by personnel strata and by experimental and control groups. There were fourteen categories developed for this question. The category headings and direct quotations from the respondents are listed on pages sixteen and seventeen. The headings were as follows;

1. Administration and Supervision
2. Teaching Skill and Experience
3. Educational Background
4. Parents and Community
5. Innovation and Evaluation
6. Staff Relations
7. Personal Character
8. Human Relations
9. Child Oriented
10. Dedication
11. Intelligence
12. Charisma
13. Professional Activities
14. Varied Background

It will be remembered that the rank correlation coefficient was used to measure the degree of relationship between sets of ranks with respect to question twenty-one. The same statistical techniques were used to interpret the responses to question twenty-two. It may be meaningful, at this time, for the reader to review these techniques as reported on page twenty-one.

Summary Table 25 presents the rank order correlations between the experimental and control groups.

TABLE 25

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS

BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

QUESTION 22

Position	Correlation
1. Total Experimental vs. Total Control	.991*
2. Administrators - Experimental vs. Control	.941*
3. Teachers - Experimental vs. Control	.991*
4. Secretaries - Experimental vs. Control	.868*
5. Community Boards - Experimental vs. Control	.799*
6. Parents - Experimental vs. Control	.869*

* Significant at .01 level
df = 12

When we compare the total experimental with the total control group, the obtained correlation of .997 was significant at the .01 level. Similarly, when we compared the experimental with the control group of administrators, teachers, secretaries, community boards, and parents the correlations obtained were significant at the .01 level. We are now able to reject the null hypothesis insofar as the professional characteristics of principals are concerned. In only one case out of 100 was it possible that the level of significance reached was due to chance. It is safe to say that both our professional and lay populations connected with inner city schools (Title I Schools) evidenced a high degree of agreement with the professional and lay populations connected with the non-inner city schools (non-Title I Schools). There is a high degree of agreement between these groups in ranking the professional characteristics of elementary school principals.

It should be noted that two personnel groups were not included in Table 25. Board of Education Members and Professors of Educational Administration were deleted from these comparisons because they do not relate exclusively with either Title I or non-Title I Schools. These personnel groups relate to both types of schools. It will be remembered that these two groups were excluded from Table 2 on page twenty-two for the same reason. Table 2 dealt with the response to question 21.

It is important to examine these correlations more closely. Table 26 presents the total response and the rank order of response to question 22 by the total experimental and control groups.

Table 26

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Total Experimental vs.Total Control

Category	Total Response	Total Rank	Response Exp.	Response Cont.	Rank Exp.	Rank Cont.	D	D^2
1	975	1	845	130	1	1	0	0
2	384	8	321	63	8	8	0	0
3	256	10	220	36	10	10	0	0
4	835	2	708	127	2	2	0	0
5	588	5	511	77	5	6	1	1
6	6	14	4	2	14	14	0	0
7	694	4	594	100	4	4	0	0
8	175	11	157	18	11	12	1	1
9	466	7	400	66	7	7	0	0
10	793	3	674	119	3	3	0	0
11	355	9	301	54	9	9	0	0
12	144	12	120	24	12	11	1	1
13	544	6	460	84	6	5	1	1
14	89	13	77	12	13	13	0	0

$\Sigma D^2 = 4$

$r = .991$

df = 12
Significant at .01

The obtained correlation of .991 was significant at the .01 level. Table 26 presents the total rank order of categories when the groups were combined in addition to the separate rank orders for the experimental and control groups. The five most frequently noted categories in rank order were: Administration and Supervision, Parents and Community, Dedication, Personal Character, and Innovation and Evaluation. Descriptions of these category headings, in the language of the respondents, will be found on pages sixteen and seventeen.

Table 27 presents the total response and the rank order of response of administrators both experimental and control.

Table 27.

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Administrators
Experimental vs. Control

Category	Total Response	Total Rank	Response Exp.	Response Cont.	Rank Exp.	Rank Cont.	D	D^2
1	144	2	128	16	2.0	3.0	1.0	1.00
2	85	6	71	14	6.0	4.5	1.5	2.25
3	29	10	27	2	10.0	11.5	1.5	2.25
4	105	4	96	9	4.0	7.0	3.0	9.00
5	74	8	68	6	7.0	9.0	2.0	4.00
6	1	14	1	0	14.0	14.0	0.0	0.00
7	118	3	101	17	3.0	2.0	1.0	1.00
8	27	12	25	2	11.5	11.5	0.0	0.00
9	76	7	63	13	8.0	6.0	2.0	4.00
10	157	1	139	18	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.00
11	42	9	35	7	9.0	8.0	1.0	1.00
12	28	11	25	3	11.5	10.0	1.5	2.25
13	97	5	83	14	5.0	4.5	0.5	0.25
14	6	13	5	1	13.0	13.0	0.0	0.00

$\Sigma D^2 = 27$
r = .941
df = 12
Significant at .01

The obtained correlation of .941 was significant at the .01 level. Table 27 presents the total rank order of categories when the groups were combined in addition to separate rank orders for the experimental and control groups. The five most frequently noted categories in rank order were: Dedication, Administration and Supervision, Personal Character, Parents and Community, and Professional Activities. Descriptions of these category headings, in the language of the respondents, will be found on pages sixteen and seventeen.

Table 28 presents the total response and the rank order of response of teachers, both experimental and control.

Table 28

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Teachers
Experimental vs Control

Category	Total Response	Total Rank	Response Exp.	Response Cont.	Rank Exp.	Rank Cont.	D	D^2
1	476	2	415	61	2	3	1	1
2	191	9	161	30	9	9	0	0
3	179	10	156	23	10	10	0	0
4	516	1	434	82	1	1	0	0
5	346	5	302	44	5	6	1	1
6	1	14	1	0	14	14	0	0
7	367	4	307	60	4	4	0	0
8	65	12	56	9	12	12	0	0
9	249	7	214	35	7	7	0	0
10	373	3	309	64	3	2	1	1
11	205	8	172	33	8	8	0	0
12	72	11	57	15	11	11	0	0
13	305	6	260	45	6	5	1	1
14	40	13	35	5	13	13	0	0

$\Sigma D^2 = 4$

$r = .991$

$df = 12$

Significant at .01

The obtained correlation of .991 was significant at the .01 level. When we combined the total rank order of response for teachers, the five most frequently noted categories in rank order were: Parents and Community, Administration and Supervision, Dedication, Personal Character, and Innovation and Evaluation. The descriptions of these category headings, in the language of the respondents, will be found on pages sixteen and seventeen.

Table 29 presents the total response and the rank order of response of experimental and control secretaries.

Table 29

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Secretaries
Experimental vs.Control

Category	Total Response	Total Rank	Response Exp.	Response Cont.	Rank Exp.	Rank Cont.	D	D^2
1	104	1	85	19	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	37	6	33	4	5.0	8.0	3.0	9.00
3	16	11	12	4	11.0	8.0	3.0	9.00
4	52	2	44	8	2.0	4.0	2.0	4.00
5	33	7	28	5	8.0	6.0	2.0	4.00
6	0	14	0	0	14.0	13.0	1.0	1.00
7	49	4	42	7	3.5	5.0	1.5	2.25
8	32	8	29	3	7.0	10.0	3.0	9.00
9	51	3	42	9	3.5	2.5	1.0	1.00
10	41	5	32	9	6.0	2.5	3.5	12.25
11	18	10	17	1	9.0	11.0	2.0	4.00
12	10	12.	10	0	12.0	13.0	1.0	1.00
13	20	9	16	4	10.0	8.0	2.0	4.00
14	3	13	3	0	13.0	13.0	0.0	0.00

$\Sigma D^2 = 60.5$
$r = .868$
df = 12
Significant at .01

The obtained correlation of .868 was significant at the .01 level. When we combined the total rank order of response for secretaries, the five most frequently noted categories in rank order were: Administration and Supervision, Parents and Community, Child Oriented, Personal Character; and Dedication. Descriptions of these category headings, in the language of the respondents, will be found on pages sixteen and seventeen.

Table 30 presents the total response and the rank order of response of experimental and control community boards.

Table 30

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Community Boards
Experimental vs.Control

Category	Total Response	Total Rank	Response Exp.	Response Cont.	Rank Exp.	Rank Cont.	D	D^2
1	112	1	99	13	1	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	34	7	29	5	8	7.5	0.5	0.25
3	14	12	11	3	12	10.0	2.0	4.00
4	56	4	49	7	5	4.0	1.0	1.00
5	62	3	53	9	3	3.0	0.0	0.00
6	2	14	0	2	14	12.0	2.0	4.00
7	50	6	44	6	6	5.5	0.5	0.25
8	21	10	19	2	10	12.0	2.0	4.00
9	31	9	30	1	7	14.0	7.0	49.00
10	81	2	71	10	2	2.0	0.0	0.00
11	32	8	26	6	9	5.5	3.5	12.25
12	9	13	7	2	13	12.0	1.0	1.00
13	55	5	50	5	4	7.5	3.5	12.25
14	19	11	15	4	11	9.0	2.0	4.00

$\Sigma D^2 = 92$

$r = .799$

$df = 12$

Significant at .01

The obtained correlation of .799 reached significance at the .01 level. When we combine the total rank order of response for community boards, the five most frequently noted categories in rank order were: Administration and Supervision, Dedication, Innovation and Evaluation, Parents and Community, and Professional Activities. These category headings are described, in the language of the respondents, on pages sixteen and seventeen.

Table 31 presents the total response and the rank order of response of experimental and control parents.

Table 31

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Parents
Experimental vs. Control

Category	Total Response	Total Rank	Response Exp.	Response Cont.	Rank Exp.	Rank Cont.	D	D^2
1	91	1.0	70	21	1.0	1.5	0.5	0.25
2	32	8.5	22	10	9.0	6.5	2.5	6.25
3	15	12.5	11	4	12.5	10.5	2.0	4.00
4	69	3.0	48	21	4.0	1.5	2.5	6.25
5	53	5.0	40	13	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.00
6	2	14.0	2	0	14.0	14.0	0.0	0.00
7	67	4.0	57	10	3.0	6.5	3.5	12.25
8	18	10.5	16	2	10.5	12.5	2.0	4.00
9	32	8.5	24	8	8.0	8.0	0.0	0.00
10	81	2.0	63	18	2.0	3.0	1.0	1.00
11	44	7.0	37	7	6.0	9.0	3.0	9.00
12	15	12.5	11	4	12.5	10.5	2.0	4.00
13	49	6.0	33	16	7.0	4.0	3.0	9.00
14	18	10.0	16	2	10.5	12.5	2.0	4.00

$\Sigma D^2 = 60$
$r = .869$
$df = 12$
Significant at .01

The obtained correlation of .869 reached significance at the .01 level. When we combined the total rank order of response for parents, the five most frequently noted categories in rank order were: Administration and Supervision, Dedication, Parents and Community, Personal Character, and Innovation and Evaluation. Descriptions of these category headings, in the language of the respondents, will be found on pages sixteen and seventeen.

Tables 25 through 30 analyzed the data by community approach (Experimental vs. Control). These comparisons of inner city school personnel vs. non-inner city school personnel enabled us to reject the situational approach to the conceptualization of educational leadership. We can say that the various communities within the City of New York perceive the professional characteristics of the "successful" elementary school principal similarly.

Additional comparisons were made with respect to the professional characteristics of inner city school elementary principals. The tables to follow analyze the data by total personnel sub-strata without regard to experimental or control groups. Table 32 presents the correlations between total groups in each position.

Table 32

Rank Order Correlations

Between Total Groups in Each Position
Question 22

Position	Correlation
1. Administrators vs. Teachers	.926*
2. Administrators vs. Secretaries	.838*
3. Administrators vs. Professors	.881*
4. Administrators vs. Community Boards	.873*
5. Administrators vs. Parents	.905*
6. Teachers vs. Secretaries	.847*
7. Teachers vs. Professors	.912*
8. Teachers vs. Community Boards	.904*
9. Teachers vs. Parents	.942*
10. Secretaries vs. Professors	.853*
11. Secretaries vs. Community Boards	.781*
12. Secretaries vs. Parents	.818*
13. Professors vs. Community Boards	.850*
14. Professors vs. Parents	.917*
15. Community Boards vs. Parents	.968*

* Significant at .01 level
df = 12

Summary Table 32 presents fifteen correlations which examine the relationship between personnel groups. It should be noted that one personnel group was not included in this table. Board of Education Members were deleted from these comparisons because the n (3) was not sufficient for meaningful interpretation. Each of the correlations was significant at the .01 level. It can be concluded, therefore, that our personnel groups evidenced a high degree of agreement in ranking the professional characteristics of principals. The highest correlation is .968, the lowest is .781. This range of correlations is somewhat lower than the range of correlations comparing the experimental and control groups. Table 25 on page forty-five

reports a range of correlations from .991 to .799. We may say that there is a higher degree of agreement between our experimental and control groups by personnel strata than among total personnel strata. In each case, however, the correlations were sufficiently high to reject the null hypothesis of zero correlation. In other words, the various personnel groups view the professional characteristics of principals similarly. The findings with respect to question 22 parallel the findings of question 21. In both cases the obtained correlations reached significant levels. In both cases the correlations were higher when comparing experimental and control groups within personnel strata than when comparing total personnel groups against other total personnel groups (See page 29).

The tables to follow (Tables 33-47) present the total response and the rank order of response of the fifteen comparisons presented in Summary Table 32.

Table 33

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Administrators vs. Teachers

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Administrators	Teachers	Administrators	Teachers		
1	144	476	2	2	0	0
2	85	191	6	9	3	9
3	29	179	10	10	0	0
4	105	516	4	1	3	9
5	74	346	8	5	3	9
6	1	1	14	14	0	0
7	118	367	3	4	1	1
8	27	65	12	12	0	0
9	76	249	7	7	0	0
10	157	373	1	3	2	4
11	42	205	9	8	1	1
12	28	72	11	11	0	0
13	97	305	5	6	1	1
14	6	40	13	13	0	0

$\Sigma D^2 = 34$

$r = .926$

df = 12

Significant at .01

Table 34

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Administrators vs. Secretaries

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Administrators	Secretaries	Administrators	Secretaries		
1	144	104	2	1	1	1
2	85	37	6	6	0	0
3	29	16	10	11	1	1
4	105	52	4	2	2	4
5	74	33	8	7	1	1
6	1	0	14	14	0	0
7	118	49	3	4	1	1
8	27	32	12	8	4	16
9	76	51	7	3	4	16
10	157	41	1	5	4	16
11	42	18	9	10	1	1
12	28	10	11	12	1	1
13	97	20	5	9	4	16
14	6	3	13	13	0	0

$\Sigma D^2 = 74$
$r = .838$
$df = 12$
Significant at .01

Table 35

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Administrators vs. Professors

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Administrators	Professors	Administrators	Professors		
1	144	48	2	2.0	0.0	0.00
2	85	5	6	11.0	5.0	25.00
3	29	3	10	12.5	2.5	6.25
4	105	37	4	4.0	0.0	0.00
5	74	20	8	6.0	2.0	4.00
6	1	0	14	14.0	0.0	0.00
7	118	43	3	3.0	0.0	0.00
8	27	12	12	9.0	3.0	9.00
9	76	27	7	5.0	2.0	4.00
10	157	60	1	1.0	0.0	0.00
11	42	14	9	8.0	1.0	1.00
12	28	10	11	10.0	1.0	1.00
13	97	19	5	7.0	2.0	4.00
14	6	3	13	12.5	0.5	0.25

$\Sigma D^2 = 54.5$

$r = .881$

$df = 12$

Significant at .01

Table 36

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Administrators vs. Community Boards

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Administrators	Community	Administrators	Community		
1	144	112	2	1	1	1
2	85	34	6	7	1	1
3	29	14	10	12	2	4
4	105	56	4	4	0	0
5	74	62	8	3	5	25
6	1	2	14	14	0	0
7	118	50	3	6	3	9
8	27	21	12	10	2	4
9	76	31	7	9	2	4
10	157	81	1	2	1	1
11	42	32	9	8	1	1
12	28	9	11	13	2	4
13	97	55	5	5	0	0
14	6	19	13	11	2	4

$\Sigma D^2 = 58$

$r = .873$

df = 12

Significant at .01

Table 37

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Administrators vs Parents

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Administrators	Parents	Administrators	Parents		
1	144	91	2	1.0	1.0	1.00
2	85	32	6	8.5	2.5	6.25
3	29	15	10	12.5	2.5	6.25
4	105	69	4	3.0	1.0	1.00
5	74	53	8	5.0	3.0	9.00
6	1	2	14	14.0	0.0	0.00
7	118	67	3	4.0	1.0	1.00
8	27	18	12	10.5	1.5	2.25
9	76	32	7	8.5	1.5	2.25
10	157	81	1	2.0	1.0	1.00
11	42	44	9	7.0	2.0	4.00
12	28	15	11	12.5	1.5	2.25
13	97	49	5	6.0	1.0	1.00
14	6	18	13	10.5	2.5	6.25

$\Sigma D^2 = 43.5$

$r = .905$

df = 12

Significant at .01

Table 38

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Teachers vs. Secretaries

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Teachers	Secretaries	Teachers	Secretaries		
1	476	104	2	1	1	1
2	191	37	9	6	3	9
3	179	16	10	11	1	1
4	516	52	1	2	1	1
5	346	33	5	7	2	4
6	1	0	14	14	0	0
7	367	49	4	4	0	0
8	65	32	12	8	4	16
9	249	51	7	3	4	16
10	373	41	3	5	2	4
11	205	18	8	10	2	4
12	72	10	11	13	2	4
13	305	20	6	9	3	9
14	40	3	13	12	1	1

$\Sigma D^2 = 70$

$r = .847$

$df = 12$

Significant at .01

Table 39

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Teachers vs. Professors

	Response		Rank			
Category	Teachers	Professors	Teachers	Professors	D	D^2
1	476	48	2	2.0	0.0	0.00
2	191	5	9	11.0	2.0	4.00
3	179	3	10	12.5	2.5	6.25
4	516	37	1	4.0	3.0	9.00
5	346	20	5	6.0	1.0	1.00
6	1	0	14	14.0	0.0	0.00
7	367	43	4	3.0	1.0	1.00
8	65	12	12	9.0	3.0	9.00
9	249	27	7	5.0	2.0	4.00
10	373	60	3	1.0	2.0	4.00
11	205	14	8	8.0	0.0	0.00
12	72	10	11	10.0	1.0	1.00
13	305	19	6	7.0	1.0	1.00
14	40	3	13	12.5	0.5	0.25

$\Sigma D^2 = 40.50$

$r = .912$

$df = 12$

Significant at .01

Table 40

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Teachers vs. Community Boards

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Teachers	Community	Teachers	Community		
1	476	112	2	1	1	1
2	191	34	9	7	2	4
3	179	14	10	12	2	4
4	516	56	1	4	3	9
5	346	62	5	3	2	4
6	1	2	14	14	0	0
7	367	50	4	6	2	4
8	65	21	12	10	2	4
9	249	31	7	9	2	4
10	373	81	3	2	1	1
11	205	32	8	8	0	0
12	72	9	11	13	2	4
13	305	55	6	5	1	1
14	40	19	13	11	2	4

$\Sigma D^2 = 44$

$r = .904$

$df = 12$

Significant at .01

Table 41

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Teachers vs. Parents

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Teachers	Parents	Teachers	Parents		
1	476	91	2	1.0	1.0	1.00
2	191	32	9	8.5	0.5	0.25
3	179	15	10	12.5	2.5	6.25
4	516	69	1	3.0	2.0	4.00
5	346	53	5	5.0	0.0	0.00
6	1	2	14	14.0	0.0	0.00
7	367	67	4	4.0	0.0	0.00
8	65	18	12	10.5	1.5	2.25
9	249	32	7	8.5	1.5	2.25
10	373	81	3	2.0	1.0	1.00
11	205	44	8	7.0	1.0	1.00
12	72	15	11	12.5	1.5	2.25
13	305	49	6	6.0	0.0	0.00
14	40	18	13	10.5	2.5	6.25

$\sum D^2 = 26.5$

r= .942

df = 12

Significant at .01

Table 42

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Secretaries vs.Professors

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Secretaries	Professors	Secretaries	Professors		
1	104	48	1	2.0	1.0	1.00
2	37	5	6	11.0	5.0	25.00
3	16	3	11	12.5	1.5	2.25
4	52	37	2	4.0	2.0	4.00
5	33	20	7	6.0	1.0	1.00
6	0	0	14	14.0	0.0	0.00
7	49	43	4	3.0	1.0	1.00
8	32	12	8	9.0	1.0	1.00
9	51	27	3	5.0	2.0	4.00
10	41	60	5	1.0	4.0	16.00
11	18	14	10	8.0	2.0	4.00
12	10	10	12	10.0	2.0	4.00
13	20	19	9	7.0	2.0	4.00
14	3	3	13	12.5	0.5	0.25

$\Sigma D^2 = 67.5$

$r = .853$

df = 12

Significant at.01

Table 43

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Secretaries vs. Community Boards

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Secretaries	Community	Secretaries	Community		
1	104	112	1	1	0	0
2	37	34	6	7	1	1
3	16	14	11	12	1	1
4	52	56	2	4	2	4
5	33	62	7	3	4	16
6	0	2	14	14	0	0
7	49	50	4	6	2	4
8	32	21	8	10	2	4
9	51	31	3	9	6	36
10	41	81	5	2	3	9
11	18	32	10	8	2	4
12	10	9	12	13	1	1
13	20	55	9	5	4	16
14	3	19	13	11	2	4

$\Sigma D^2 = 100.$

$r = .781$

df = 12

Significant at .01

Table 44

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Secretaries vs.Parents

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Secretaries	Parents	Secretaries	Parents		
1	104	91	1	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	37	32	6	8.5	2.5	6.25
3	16	15	11	12.5	1.5	2.25
4	52	69	2	3.0	1.0	1.00
5	33	53	7	5.0	2.0	4.00
6	0	2	14	14.0	0.0	0.00
7	49	67	4	4.0	0.0	0.00
8	32	18	8	10.5	2.5	6.25
9	51	32	3	8.5	5.5	30.25
10	41	81	5	2.0	3.0	9.00
11	18	44	10	7.0	3.0	9.00
12	10	15	12	12.5	0.5	0.25
13	20	49	9	6.0	3.0	9.00
14	3	18	13	10.5	2.5	6.25

$\Sigma D^2 = 83.5$

$r = .818$

df = 12

Significant at .01

Table 45

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Professors vs. Community Boards

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Professors	Community	Professors	Community		
1	48	112	2.0	1	1.0	1.00
2	5	34	11.0	7	4.0	16.00
3	3	14	12.5	12	0.5	0.25
4	37	56	4.0	4	0.0	0.00
5	20	62	6.0	3	3.0	9.00
6	0	2	14.0	14	0.0	0.00
7	43	50	3.0	6	3.0	9.00
8	12	21	9.0	10	1.0	1.00
9	27	31	5.0	9	4.0	16.00
10	60	81	1.0	2	1.0	1.00
11	14	32	8.0	8	0.0	0.00
12	10	9	10.0	13	3.0	9.00
13	19	55	7.0	5	2.0	4.00
14	3	19	12.5	11	1.5	2.25

$\Sigma D^2 = 68.5$

$r = .850$

df = 12

Significant at .01

Table 46

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Professors vs. Parents

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Professors	Parents	Professors	Parents		
1	48	91	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.00
2	5	32	11.0	8.5	2.5	6.25
3	3	15	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.00
4	37	69	4.0	3.0	1.0	1.00
5	20	53	6.0	5.0	1.0	1.00
6	0	2	14.0	14.0	0.0	0.00
7	43	67	3.0	4.0	1.0	1.00
8	12	18	9.0	10.5	1.5	2.25
9	27	32	5.0	8.5	3.5	12.25
10	60	81	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.00
11	14	44	8.0	7.0	1.0	1.00
12	10	15	10.0	12.5	2.5	6.25
13	19	49	7.0	6.0	1.0	1.00
14	3	18	12.5	10.5	2.0	4.00

$\Sigma D^2 = 38$

$r = .917$

df = 12

Significant at .01

Table 47

Rank Order of Response to Question 22, Professional Characteristics

Community Boards vs. Parents

Category	Response		Rank		D	D^2
	Community	Parents	Community	Parents		
1	112	91	1	1.0	0.0	0.00
2	34	32	7	8.5	1.5	2.25
3	14	15	12	12.5	0.5	0.25
4	56	69	4	3.0	1.0	1.00
5	62	53	3	5.0	2.0	4.00
6	2	2	14	14.0	0.0	0.00
7	50	67	6	4.0	2.0	4.00
8	21	18	10	10.5	0.5	0.25
9	31	32	9	8.5	0.5	0.25
10	81	81	2	2.0	0.0	0.00
11	32	44	8	7.0	1.0	1.00
12	9	15	13	12.5	0.5	0.25
13	55	49	5	6.0	1.0	1.00
14	19	18	11	10.5	0.5	0.25

$\Sigma D^2 = 14.5$

r= .968

df = 12

Significant at .01

IV Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance, W

In the previous sections of this chapter we have been concerned with correlations between a series of sets of rankings by two groups. When examining the relationship among three or more sets of rankings, one ranking was selected and the Spearman Rho coefficient computed between it and all of the others. This process was then continued until a Rho coefficient had been obtained between each set of two ranks. This technique was followed and presented in sections two and three of this chapter. This section will be devoted to another technique of examining relationships between three or more sets of ranks: a measure of the relationship among several sets of ranking simultaneously.

Kendall has developed a technique called the Coefficient of Concordance which permits the researcher to determine the overall relationship among the rankings. Perfect agreement is indicated by W = 1 and lack of agreement by W = 0. The significance of the Coefficient of Concordance may be tested by the use of tables developed by Kendall.[23]

A high or significant value of W may be interpreted as meaning that the observers or judges are applying essentially the same standard in ranking the criteria under study. Their pooled ordering may serve as a standard, especially when there is no relevant external criterion for the ordering. It should be emphasized that a high or significant value of W does not mean that the ordering or rankings observed is correct. It should be borne in mind that "objective" orderings are not synonymous with "consensual" orderings. The W is useful in determining the degree of agreement among several sets of judges. It provides a standard method of ordering criteria according to consensus when there is available no objective order of the criteria.

Table 48 presents the coefficient of concordance for the ranking of nineteen personal categories of ten experimental and control groups. Because of the number of tied observations, the correction formula was introduced $\left(T = \frac{\Sigma(t^3 - t)}{12}\right)$.

23 N. Downie and R. Heath, Basic Statistical Methods, Harper, & Bros., N.Y. 1959, pp. 282-283.

Table 48

Coefficient of Concordance
Ranking of Nineteen Categories by Ten
Experimental and Control Groups
Question 21

	Personnel Ranks													
	Experimental					Control					Sum of Ranks	D	D^2
	Administrators	Teachers	Secretaries	Communities	Parents	Administrators	Teachers	Secretaries	Communities	Parents			
1. Human Relations	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	10.0	90.0	8100.00
2. Fair Minded	9.0	4.0	2.0	13.0	16.0	8.0	2.0	4.5	11.5	4.0	74.0	26.0	676.00
3. Staff Relations	16.5	5.0	15.0	16.0	16.0	17.0	4.0	9.5	15.5	15.0	129.5	29.5	870.25
4. Integrity	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.5	6.0	5.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	31.5	68.5	4692.25
5. Good Humored	8.0	6.0	5.0	9.0	10.5	3.0	6.0	3.0	5.5	8.0	64.0	36.0	1296.00
6. Child Oriented	11.0	7.5	8.5	10.5	3.5	13.0	9.5	16.5	8.5	3.0	91.5	8.5	72.25
7. Scholarship	4.0	7.5	7.0	4.0	5.5	4.0	7.0	12.5	5.5	9.5	66.5	33.5	1122.25
8. Parents and Community	15.0	12.0	16.5	6.0	5.5	15.5	9.5	16.5	5.5	6.0	108.0	8.0	64.00
9. Decision Making	13.0	14.0	12.0	17.0	12.5	13.0	14.0	16.5	15.5	18.0	145.5	45.5	2070.25
10. Administration and Supervision	10.0	13.0	6.0	12.0	12.5	13.0	12.0	7.5	11.5	16.0	113.5	13.5	182.25
11. Emotional Stability	6.5	9.0	8.5	10.5	8.0	10.5	11.0	4.5	15.5	9.5	93.5	6.5	42.25
12. Dedication	6.5	10.0	12.0	5.0	14.0	5.0	15.0	12.5	5.5	13.0	98.5	1.5	2.25
13. Personal Appearance and Health	12.0	17.0	12.0	14.0	16.0	8.0	17.0	7.5	13.0	7.0	123.5	23.5	552.25
14. Innovative	2.0	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	6.0	3.0	5.0	32.0	68.0	4624.00
15. Humility	18.0	19.0	19.0	19.0	18.5	18.5	18.5	19.0	18.5	19.0	187.0	87.0	7569.00
16. Authoritative	19.0	16.0	12.0	18.0	8.0	18.5	16.0	12.5	15.5	12.0	147.0	47.0	2209.00
17. Charisma	5.0	11.0	12.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	12.5	8.5	11.0	92.0	8.0	64.00
18. Communication Skills	14.0	15.0	18.0	15.0	10.5	10.5	13.0	9.5	18.5	14.0	138.0	38.0	1444.00
19. Teaching Skill and Experience	16.5	18.0	16.5	7.0	18.5	15.5	18.5	16.5	10.0	17.0	154.5	54.5	2970.25
											Σ = 1900.	Σ =	38622.5

W = .684
Significant at .01

The W of .684 was found to be significant at the .01 level. This confirms the rank order correlations revealed in Summary Table 2 on page twenty-two. We are able to reject the null hypothesis of zero concordance. Our professional and lay populations connected with inner city schools (Title I Schools) evidenced a significantly high degree of concordance with the professional and lay population connected with our non-inner city schools (non-Title I Schools). There is, therefore, a significant degree of concordance between the experimental and control population in ranking the personal characteristics of elementary school principals.

Table 49 presents the coefficient of concordance in the ranking of nineteen personal categories by total personnel groups.

Table 49

Coefficient of Concordance
Ranking of Nineteen Categories by Six
Total Personnel Groups

Question 21

Category	Personnel Ranks						Sum of Ranks	D	D^2
	Administrators	Teachers	Secretaries	Communities	Parents	Professors			
1. Human Relations	1	1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	6.0	54.0	2916.00
2. Fair Minded	9	3	3.0	13.0	5.5	14.0	47.5	12.5	156.25
3. Staff Relations	17	6	14.5	16.0	16.0	18.5	88.0	28.0	784.00
4. Integrity	3	4	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.5	16.5	43.5	1892.25
5. Good Humored	6	5	5.0	9.0	7.0	2.0	34.0	26.0	676.00
6. Child Oriented	11	8	9.0	10.0	3.0	8.5	49.5	10.5	110.25
7. Scholarship	4	7	8.0	4.0	9.0	5.0	37.0	23.0	529.00
8. Parents and Community	15	12	16.5	6.0	5.5	15.0	70.0	10.0	100.00
9. Decision Making	13	14	14.5	17.0	17.0	8.5	84.0	24.0	576.00
10. Administration and Supervision	10	13	6.0	11.5	15.0	12.0	67.5	7.5	56.25
11. Emotional Stability	8	9	7.0	11.5	10.0	10.0	55.5	4.5	20.25
12. Dedication	7	11	12.0	5.0	14.0	6.5	55.5	4.5	20.25
13. Personal Appearance and Health	12	17	10.0	14.0	8.0	6.5	67.5	7.5	56.25
14. Innovative	2	2	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	18.5	41.5	1722.25
15. Humility	18	19	19.0	19.0	19.0	16.5	110.5	50.5	2550.25
16. Authoritative	19	16	12.0	18.0	12.0	18.5	95.5	35.5	1260.25
17. Charisma	5	10	12.0	7.5	11.0	13.0	58.5	1.5	2.25
18. Communication Skills	14	15	18.0	15.0	13.0	11.0	86.0	26.0	676.00
19. Teaching Skill and Experience	16	18	16.5	7.5	18.0	16.5	92.5	32.5	1056.25
							Σ = 1140.0		Σ = 15160.00

W = .739
Significant at .01

Table 49 analyzes the responses of total personnel sub-strata without regard to experimental and control groups. The obtained W of .739 is significant at the .01 level. We may reject the null hypothesis of zero concordance. This supports the significant correlations presented in Summary Table 9 on page twenty-nine. It can be concluded, therefore, that our personnel groups evidenced a significant degree of concordance in ranking the personal characteristics of principals.

Table 50 presents the coefficient of concordance in the ranking of fourteen professional categories by ten experimental and control groups with regard to question 22. The correction formula was utilized because of the number of tied observations.

Table 50

Coefficient of Concordance
Ranking of Fourteen Categories by Ten
Experimental and Control Groups
Question 22

Category	Experimental Personnel Ranks					Control Personnel Ranks					Sum of Ranks	D	D^2
	Administrators	Teachers	Secretaries	Communities	Parents	Administrators	Teachers	Secretaries	Communities	Parents			
1. Administration and Supervision	2.0	2	1.0	1	1.0	3.0	3	1.0	1.0	1.5	16.5	58.5	3422.25
2. Teaching Skill and Experience	6.0	9	5.0	8	9.0	4.5	9	8.0	7.5	6.5	72.5	2.5	6.25
3. Educational Background	10.0	10	11.0	12	12.5	11.5	10	8.0	10.0	10.5	105.5	30.5	930.25
4. Parents and Community	4.0	1	2.0	5	4.0	7.0	1	4.0	4.0	1.5	33.5	41.5	1722.25
5. Innovation and Evaluation	7.0	5	8.0	3	5.0	9.0	6	6.0	3.0	5.0	57.0	18.0	324.00
6. Staff Relations	14.0	14	14.0	14	14.0	14.0	14	13.0	12.0	14.0	137.0	62.0	3844.00
7. Personal Character	3.0	4	3.5	6	3.0	2.0	4	5.0	5.5	6.5	42.5	32.5	1056.25
8. Human Relations	11.5	12	7.0	10	10.5	11.5	12	10.0	12.0	12.5	109.0	34.0	1156.00
9. Child Oriented	8.0	7	3.5	7	8.0	6.0	7	2.5	14.0	8.0	71.0	4.0	16.00
10. Dedication	1.0	3	6.0	2	2.0	1.0	2	2.5	2.0	3.0	24.5	50.5	2550.25
11. Intelligence	9.0	8	9.0	9	6.0	8.0	8	11.0	5.5	9.0	82.5	7.5	56.25
12. Charisma	11.5	11	12.0	13	12.5	10.0	11	13.0	12.0	10.5	116.5	41.5	1722.25
13. Professional Activities	5.0	6	10.0	4	7.0	4.5	5	8.0	7.5	4.0	61.0	14.0	196.00
14. Varied Background	13.0	13	13.0	11	10.5	13.0	13	13.0	9.0	12.5	121.0	46.0	2116.00
											Σ = 1050.		Σ = 19118.00

W = .845
Significant at.01

The obtained W of .845 was significant at the .01 level. We can reaffirm the significant correlations presented in Summary Table 25 on page forty-five. We have included the experimental and control groups of administrators, teachers, secretaries, community boards, and parents in this table and found that we are able to reject the null hypothesis insofar as the professional characteristics of principals are concerned. There is a significant degree of concordance among these groups in the ranking of the professional characteristics of elementary school principals. We can reject the concept of the situational approach to the conceptualization of leadership. There is a significant degree of agreement among the various groups (Title I vs. non-Title I) in viewing the professional characteristics of elementary school principals.

Table 51 presents the coefficient of concordance in the ranking of fourteen professional categories by six total personnal groups.

Table 51

Coefficient of Concordance
Ranking of Fourteen Categories by Six
Total Personnel Groups

Question 22

Category	Personnel Ranks						Sum of Ranks	D	D^2
	Administrators	Teachers.	Secretaries	Communities	Parents	Professors			
1. Administration and Supervision	2	2	1	1	1	2.0	9.0	36.0	1296.00
2. Teaching Skill and Experience	6	9	6	7	8	11.0	47.0	2.0	4.00
3. Educational Background	10	10	11	12	13	12.5	68.5	23.5	552.25
4. Parents and Community	4	1	2	4	3	4.0	18.0	27.0	729.00
5. Innovation and Evaluation	8	5	7	3	5	6.0	34.0	11.0	121.00
6. Staff Relations	14	14	14	14	14.	14.0	84.0	39.0	1521.00
7. Personal Character	3	4	4	6	4	3.0	24.0	21.0	441.00
8. Human Relations	12	12	8	10	11	9.0	62.0	17.0	289.00
9. Child Oriented	7	7	3	9	9	5.0	40.0	5.0	25.00
10. Dedication	1	3	5	2	2	1.0	14.0	31.0	961.00
11. Intelligence	9	8	10	8	7	8.0	50.0	5.0	25.00
12. Charisma	11	11	12	13	12	10.0	69.0	24.0	576.00
13. Professional Activities	5	6	9	5	6	7.0	38.0	7.0	49.00
14. Varied Background	13	13	13	11	10	12.5	72.5	27.5	756.25
							Σ = 630.00		Σ = 7345.50

W = .897
Significant at .01

The obtained W of .897 was significant at the .01 level. Again we can reject the null hypothesis of zero concordance. Table 51 supports the significant correlations which were presented in Summary Table 32 on page fifty-three. Table 51 examines the concordance between total personnel groups in the ranking of the professional characteristics of principals. The various personnel groups view the professional characteristics of principals with a similar set.

We can say, in summary, that there is a significantly high degree of agreement between our experimental and control groups in the ranking of both personal and professional characteristics of elementary school principals.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I Summary

This study concerned itself primarily with the development of criteria for the selection of elementary school principals for inner city schools using New York City as the prototype for other large urban centers.

The questionnaire technique was utilized with a sample population which included both professional educators and lay community representatives representing the various communities of the City of New York. The sample included district or community superintendents, elementary school principals, assistant principals, teachers, school secretaries, professors of school administration and organization, members of the Board of Education, members of local or community school boards, officers of parent organizations, and officers of community corporations and planning committees. In the Spring of 1970, two thousand six hundred and twenty-six (2,626) questionnaires were mailed to a randomly selected population. Of these, one thousand four hundred and eighty-two (1,482) were returned. This represents a return of fifty-six per cent (.56). A breakdown of the number and per cent of questionnaires returned by each personnel stratum may be examined in Table 1 on page nineteen.

The population was separated into two basic groups: experimental and control. The experimental group consisted of those persons connected with inner city schools, those schools receiving ESEA Title I assistance. The control group consisted of those persons connected with schools not eligible for nor receiving ESEA Title I assistance.

It was hoped that the data collected would permit the acceptance or rejection of the situational approach to the conceptualization of educational leadership. Do the different communities within the City of New York perceive the desirable characteristics of an elementary school principal similarly? Does each community perceive the desirable characteristics of an elementary school principal uniquely?

In addition, comparisons were made between total personnel groups to determine whether they viewed the characteristics of the elementary school principal similarly. For example, we compared the opinions of administrators with the opinions of teachers, secretaries, parents, etc. In these comparisons, affiliation with experimental or control groups was not a factor.

The data were analyzed using content analysis of responses to establish categories. The statistical technique utilized were Rho and the Coefficient of Concordance.

Table 52 presents categories in rank order of response to Questions 21 and 22 by the total population.

Table 52

Categories in Rank Order of Response to

Questions 21 and 22,

by Total Population

Personal Characteristics (Question 21)	
Rank	Category
1.	Human Relations(1)*
2.	Innovative(14)*
3.	Integrity(4)
4.	Fair Minded(2)
5.	Good Humored(5)
6.	Scholarship(7)
7.	Child Oriented(6)*
8.	Charisma(17)*
9.	Emotional Stability(11)
10.	Dedication(12)*
11.	Staff Relations(3)*
12.	Parents and Community(8)*
13.	Administration and Supervision(10)*
14.	Decision Making(9)
15.	Personal Appearance and Health(13)
16.	Communication Skills(18)
17.	Authoritative(16)
18.	Teaching Skill and Experience(19)*
19.	Humility(15)

Professional Characteristics (Question 22)	
Rank	Category
1.	Administration and Supervision(1)*
2.	Parents and Community(4)*
3.	Dedication(10)*
4.	Personal Character(7)
5.	Innovation and Evaluation(5)*
6.	Professional Activities(13)
7.	Child Oriented(9)*
8.	Teaching Skill and Experience(2)*
9.	Intelligence(11)
10.	Educational Background(3)
11.	Human Relations(8)*
12.	Charisma(12)*
13.	Varied Background(14)
14.	Staff Relations(6)*

*Categories reported in response to both Question 21 and Question 22.

The thirty-three categories indicated reflect the response of the total population to two free-response questions:

1. Question 21
   If you were selecting a principal for your school, what five personal characteristics would you consider most important?

2. Question 22
   If you were selecting a principal for your school, what five professional experiences and characteristics would you consider most important?

Pages 14 through 17 present further delineation of these category headings in the language of the respondents.

It should be noted that there is a great deal of overlapping of response to the questions under consideration. For example, although Question 21 refers to personal characteristics, the participants noted, in addition to personal traits, many professional characteristics. Conversely, they listed many personal traits when answering the question concerning professional characteristics. No attempt was made, however, to transpose these responses. It was felt that responses should be presented as reported by the respondents. The categories marked with an asterisk were found in response to both questions: Human Relations, Staff Relations, Child-Oriented, Parents and Community, Administration and Supervision, Dedication, Innovation, Charisma, and Teaching Skills and Experience.

II Findings and Conclusions

A statistically significant degree of agreement was found between our experimental and control groups concerning the rank order of the professional and personal characteristics which they would consider important in selecting the educational leaders of New York City's elementary schools. When we compared the experimental with the control group of administrators, teachers, secretaries, community boards, and parents the resultant correlations (ranging from .697 to .991) were significant at the.01 level. The null hypothesis of zero correlation is, therefore, rejected. It can be said that both our professional and lay populations connected with inner city schools (Title I Schools) evidenced a significantly high degree of agreement with the professional and lay populations connected with non-inner city schools (non-Title I Schools).

Similarly, a statistically significant degree of agreement was found between our total personnel groups concerning the rank order of the professional and personal characteristics which they would consider important in selecting the educational leaders of New York City's elementary schools.

When comparisons were made between total personnel groups (without regard to experimental or control affiliation) two of the resultant correlations were significant at .02 level and twenty-eight were significant at the .01 level; (ranging from .549 to .968). The null hypothesis of zero correlation is, therefore, rejected. It can be said that each of our personnel groups evidenced a significantly high degree of agreement regarding the rank order of professional and personal characteristics which they would consider most important in selecting an elementary school principal.

The statistical techniques utilized, Rho and Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance, provide a standard method of ordering criteria according to consensus when there is available no objective order of the criteria. The researcher is not suggesting that the orderings or rankings observed is "correct". It should be borne in mind that "objective" orderings are not synonymous with "consensual" orderings. The significant values of W and Rho may be interpreted as meaning that our study population was applying essentially the same standards or values in ranking the selection criteria which resulted.

III Recommendations

The concern of the various communities within the City of New York is to select outstanding educational leaders who will work towards providing the best teaching-learning situation for the children of the city.

It would seem that the thirty-three categories which emerged from this study should be given primary consideration in the development of selection criteria for principals of elementary schools in both the inner-city and the non-inner city school. The categories marked with an asterisk should be given additional consideration in the selection process since they were recorded in response to both questions by the study population.

Based upon the findings of this study it is recommended that:

1. The thirty-three criteria be analyzed and translated into operational definitions.

2. A careful job analysis of the position of elementary school principal be conducted.

3. The criteria and the resultant job analysis be utilized for the development of selection procedures.

4. The resulting selection procedures be validated against performance criteria.

5. The study be replicated in other than large urban centers in order to evaluate its general application.

IV Limitations

The reader should be cautioned that an inherent limitation of questionnaire studies is that responses represent expressed attitudes. It is assumed that the responses reflect the actual opinions of the various populations sampled. In any future selection schema, inclusion of the characteristics which emerged from this study must be based upon this underlying assumption.

A series of four follow-up letters were sent to encourage returns. In addition, telephone calls were made to further encourage response. Although the respondents were assured of anonymity their response or lack of response may have been influenced by many factors such as the source of the questionnaire. All of these follow-up procedures and assurances resulted in the return of fifty-six per cent of the questionnaires. Whether the non-respondents would have agreed or disagreed with the respondents is an unknown factor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, L., Lockwood S., Owens, R., Steinhoff, C., A Demonstration of the Use of Simulations in the Training of School Administrators. Office of Research and Evaluation, Division of Teacher Education of the City University of New York, 1967.

Brown, Allan F. "Reactions to Leadership," Educational Administration Quarterly 3 (Winter, 1967): 62-73.

Brownell, S.M. "Schools in the Cities," Vital Speeches, 31 (April, 1965): 380-384.

Charters, W.W.Jr. Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Behavior. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Project No. 929, 1964.

Cronbach, Lee J. Essentials of Psychological Testing. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Crosby, Muriel. "Poverty and the School," Educational Leadership, 22 (May, 1965): 546-549.

Eddy, Elizabeth M. Urban Education and Child of the Slum, New York: Project True, Hunter College, 1965.

Erickson, Donald A. "The School Administrator," Review of Educational Research, 37 (October, 1967): 417-432.

Flanagan, John C. "The Critical Incidents Technique," Psychological Bulletin, 51 (1954): 327-358.

Greene, Mary and Ryan, Orletta. The School Children: Growing up in the Slums. New York: Pantheon Books, 1965.

Gross, N. and Herriott, R.E. Staff Leadership in Public Schools. New York: John Willey and Sons, 1965.

Hadley, W.M. "The Selection of School Principals," American School Board Journal, 125 (1952): 25-26.

Halpin, Andrew. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: MacMillan, 1966.

Hemphill, John K., Griffiths, Daniel E., Frederiksen, Norman. Administrative Performance and Personality. New York: Teachers College, 1962.

Hemphill, John K. Situational Factors in Leadership. Bureau of Educational Research Monograph No. 32 Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Educational Research, 1949.

Lindley, Jessie B. The Use of Tests in the Selection of Administrative and Supervisory School Personnel. Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 1965.

Lopez, Felix M. Jr. Evaluating Executive Decision Making. New York: American Management Association Inc., 1966.

Moore, Alexander. Urban School Days: Selected Days in Urban Elementary School Life. New York: Project True, Hunter College, 1964.

Preston, Harley O. The Development of a Procedure for Evaluating Officers in the United States Air Force. Pittsburg: American Institute for Research, 1948.

Riessman, Frank. It's Time for a Moon-Shot in Education, New York: Albert Einstein College of Medicine, 1965.

Sacadat, Evelyn, "Arousing Parent Interest in a Program for the Culturally Deprived," Journal of Negro Education, 34(Spring, 1965): 195-196.

Schueler, Herbert,"Education in the Modern Urban Setting," Law and Contemporary Problems, 30 (Winter, 1965): 162-175.

Stice, G., Fredericksen, N., Hemphill, J., Griffiths, D. Criteria of Performance on School Administrators. Research Memorandum R.M. 60-17. Educational Testing Service. Princeton, New Jersey, 1960.

Wilkerson, Doxey, "Programs and Practices in Compensatory Education for Disadvantaged Children," Review of Educational Research, 35 (1965): 426-440.

The Elementary School Principalship in 1968: A Research Study, Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, 1968.

APPENDIX

Exhibit		Page
A.	Letter to Principals	87
B.	Cover Letter	88
C.	Cover Letter to Parents	89
D.	Follow-up Letter 1	90
E.	Follow-up Letter 2	91
F.	Follow-up Letter 3	92
G.	Follow-up Letter 4	93
H.	Questionnaire	1-4

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS
65 COURT STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

JAY E. GREENE, CHAIRMAN
GERTRUDE E. UNSER, VICE CHAIRMAN
PAUL DENN
MURRAY ROCKOWITZ

NATHAN BROWN, ACTING SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

THOMAS J. McGEE
ADMINISTRATOR
WILLIAM E. BROWN
DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR
SIEGFRIED ROTH
SECRETARY

May 25, 1970

In connection with the Board of Education project supported by the United States Office of Education entitled, "Development of Selection Criteria for Elementary School Principals of Inner City Schools," your school has been selected by random sample technique for participation in our study population.

At this time we are collecting the names of the newly elected 1970-1971 officers (President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer) of the Parents' Associations of selected schools. Please have these names listed below and have the statement returned to us at your earliest convenience in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Deena Teitelbaum

DT:rb
Enc.

Deena Teitelbaum
Project Director

Name (Please Print)	Parents' Association Position (1970-1971)

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS
65 COURT STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

JAY E. GREENE, CHAIRMAN
GERTRUDE E. UNSER, VICE CHAIRMAN
PAUL DENN
MURRAY ROCKOWITZ

NATHAN BROWN, ACTING SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

THOMAS J. McGEE
ADMINISTRATOR
WILLIAM E. BROWN
DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR
SIEGFRIED ROTH
SECRETARY

September 28, 1970

Ladies and Gentlemen:

In conjunction with the United States Office of Education, we are conducting a research study concerning selection criteria for elementary school principals of inner city schools. We are requesting your help in preparing a list of characteristics which would make for a successful elementary school principal in your community. This information is being collected as part of an over-all reexamination of the standards by which principals are selected. What personal and professional characteristics should a man or woman have in order to run a successful elementary school in your community? We are asking these questions of parents, school board members, principals, assistant principals, teachers, school secretaries, and other groups throughout the city.

The Board of Education, the Superintendent of Schools, the Council of Supervisory Associations and the United Federation of Teachers have endorsed the project and urge your cooperation.

By completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to us, your voice will be heard. Of course, your response will be kept confidential. No individual will be identifiable in the resultant report and all answers will be used for research purposes only.

We deeply appreciate your cooperation in this effort to improve the educational opportunities for the children of the City of New York. In order to expedite this study, we would appreciate your returning this questionnaire within one week in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

Sincerely yours,

Deena Teitelbaum

Deena Teitelbaum
Project Director

DT:rb

Approved:

Murray Rockowitz

Dr. Murray Rockowitz
Examiner

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS
65 COURT STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

JAY E. GREENE, CHAIRMAN
GERTRUDE E. UNSER, VICE CHAIRMAN
PAUL DENN
MURRAY ROCKOWITZ

NATHAN BROWN, ACTING SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

THOMAS J. McGEE
ADMINISTRATOR
WILLIAM E. BROWN
DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR
SIEGFRIED ROTH
SECRETARY

September 28, 1970

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The Board of Education and the United States Office of Education is conducting a research study on the standards for selecting principals of elementary schools. We are asking you to indicate the personal and professional qualities you feel a person should have in order to become a successful principal for your child's school. We are also asking these questions of local school board members, principals, assistant principals, teachers, school secretaries, and other groups throughout the city.

The Superintendent of Schools, the Council of Supervisory Associations and the United Federation of Teachers endorsed the project and urge your cooperation.

By completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to us, your voice will be heard. Of course, your response will be kept confidential. All answers will be used for research purposes only. Please return this questionnaire within one week in the enclosed envelope.

We deeply appreciate your help in this effort to improve the educational opportunities for the children of the City of New York.

Sincerely,

Deena Teitelbaum

Deena Teitelbaum
Project Director

DT:rb

Approved:

Murray Rockowitz

Dr. Murray Rockowitz
Examiner

(For Spanish Translation Please See Reverse Side)

89.a

El 28 de septiembre, 1970

Señoras y señores:

La Junta de Instrucción de Nueva York y la Oficina de Instrucción de los Estados Unidos están llevando a cabo una investigación sobre las normas de selección de principales de las escuelas elementales. Le pedimos que nos haga el favor de indicar los rasgos personales y profesionales que Vd. cree necesarios para los principales de las escuelas de sus hijos. Les estamos haciendo las mismas preguntas a los miembros de las juntas escolares de la comunidad, a los principales, a sus ayudantes, a los maestros, a los secretarios empleados en las escuelas y a otros grupos de ciudadanos de Nueva York.

El superintendente de escuelas, el concilio de asociaciones supervisoras y la federación de maestros han aprobado el plan y piden su cooperación.

Al llenar el formulario adjunto y al devolvérnoslo, Vd. expresará su propia opinión. Claro que su respuesta será considerada confidencial y se empleará solamente en nuestra investigación. Sírvase devolver este formulario dentro de una semana en el sobre adjunto.

Si Vd. prefiere la traducción al español del formulario, se la enviaremos al recibir éste con su nombre y su dirección en el espacio indicado.

Le agradecemos sinceramente la ayuda que nos ha prestado en este nuestro esfuerzo por mejorar las escuelas para los niños de la ciudad de Nueva York.

Me quedo de Vd.,

Deena Teitelbaum
Directora del Plan

Su apellido_____ Su(s) nombre(s)_____

Su dirección_____ _____ _____
(calle) (condado) (zip code)

(Véase la traducción al inglés al otro lado)

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS
65 COURT STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

JAY E. GREENE, CHAIRMAN
GERTRUDE E. UNSER, VICE CHAIRMAN
PAUL DENN
MURRAY ROCKOWITZ

NATHAN BROWN, ACTING SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

THOMAS J. McGEE
ADMINISTRATOR
WILLIAM E. BROWN
DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR
SIEGFRIED ROTH
SECRETARY

October 30, 1970

On September 28 a questionnaire was sent to you in connection with a study concerning selection criteria for elementary school principals of inner city schools. This information is being collected in conjunction with the United States Office of Education.

Your name was scientifically selected to take part in the study. Please be assured that your response will be kept strictly confidential. All answers will be used for research purposes only. No individual will be identified.

If you have misplaced your questionnaire, please call 596-6389 or 6030 and another copy will be sent to you.

We deeply appreciate your cooperation in this matter and anticipate your early response so that the necessary data may be supplied to the United States Office of Education.

Sincerely yours,

Deena Teitelbaum
Deena Teitelbaum
Project Director

DT:ek

Approved

Murray Rockowitz
Dr. Murray Rockowitz, Examiner

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS
65 COURT STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

JAY E. GREENE, CHAIRMAN
GERTRUDE E. UNSER, VICE CHAIRMAN
PAUL DENN
MURRAY ROCKOWITZ

NATHAN BROWN, ACTING SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

THOMAS J. McGEE
ADMINISTRATOR

WILLIAM E. BROWN
DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR

SIEGFRIED ROTH
SECRETARY

On September 28 a questionnaire was sent to you in connection with a study concerning selection criteria for elementary school principals of inner city schools. This information is being collected in conjunction with the United States Office of Education.

Your name was scientifically selected to take part in the study. Please be assured that your response will be kept strictly confidential. All answers will be used for research purposes only. No individual will be identified.

If you have misplaced your questionnaire, please call 596-6389 or 6030 and another copy will be sent to you.

We deeply appreciate your cooperation in this matter and anticipate your early response so that the necessary data may be supplied to the United States Office of Education.

Sincerely yours,

Deena Teitelbaum

Deena Teitelbaum
Project Director

DT:rb
F. 1a

Approved

Murray Rockowitz

Dr. Murray Rockowitz, Examiner

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS
65 COURT STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

JAY E. GREENE, CHAIRMAN
GERTRUDE E. UNSER, VICE CHAIRMAN
PAUL DENN
MURRAY ROCKOWITZ

*NATHAN BROWN, ACTING SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

THOMAS J. McGEE
ADMINISTRATOR

WILLIAM E. BROWN
DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR

SIEGFRIED ROTH
SECRETARY

To date we have not heard from you regarding the questionnaire which was sent to you on September 28, 1970. We are collecting data concerning elementary school principals of inner city schools. This information is being collected in conjunction with the United States Office of Education.

Your name was scientifically selected for the study. Please be assured that your response will be kept strictly confidential. All answers will be used for research purposes only. No individual will be identified.

If you have misplaced your questionnaire, please call 596-6389 or 6030 and another copy will be sent to you immediately.

By completing the questionnaire and returning it to us, your voice will be heard. We deeply appreciate your cooperation in this effort to improve the educational opportunities for the children of the City of New York. We anticipate your early response so that the necessary data may be supplied to the United States Office of Education.

Sincerely yours,

Deena Teitelbaum

Deena Teitelbaum
Project Director

DT:ek
F12
Approved:

Murray Rockowitz

Dr. Murray Rockowitz, Examiner

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS
65 COURT STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

JAY E. GREEN, CHAIRMAN
GERTRUDE E. UNSER, VICE CHAIRMAN
PAUL DENN
MURRAY ROCKOWITZ

NATHAN BROWN, ACTING SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

THOMAS J. McGEE
ADMINISTRATOR
WILLIAM E. BROWN
DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR
SIEGFRIED ROTH
SECRETARY

We have not yet received the questionnaire which was mailed to you in September 1970. You will recall that we are collecting data concerning selection criteria of elementary school principals of inner city schools.

This information is being collected in conjunction with a study sponsored by the United States Office of Education.

Your name was selected at random. May we again assure you that your response will be kept strictly confidential. All answers will be used for research purposes only. No individual will be identified.

If you have misplaced your questionnaire, please call 596-6389, or 6030 and another copy will be sent to you immediately.

Your help in this effort to improve the educational opportunities for the children of the City of New York is deeply appreciated. Your completed questionnaire will furnish the necessary data to be presented to the United States Office of Education.

Very truly yours,

Deena Teitelbaum

Deena Teitelbaum
Project Director

DT:ek
F13
Approved:

Murray Rockowitz

Dr. Murray Rockowitz

Function No. 901601

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
BOARD OF EXAMINERS
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT UNIT
65 COURT STREET
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11201

Mr.
Miss
Mrs.
Name Dr. _____, _____
(please print) last first

Home Address _____ _____ _____
Street Borough City

School Number _____ _____ _____
(For School Personnel) Borough District

Present Position (Please place a check ✓ next to your current position.)

1. District Superintendent _____
2. Principal _____
3. Assistant Principal _____
4. Teacher _____
5. School Secretary _____
6. Professor of Educational Administration _____
7. Board of Education Member _____
8. Community School Board Member _____
9. Parent Organization Member _____
10. Community Corporation Member _____

EXPECTATIONS FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL'S PERFORMANCE

QUESTION: WHAT DO YOU FEEL THE PRINCIPAL SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT DO ABOUT THE FOLLOWING?

Check ✓ one response for each statement.	1 Absolutely Must	2 Preferably Should	3 May or May Not	4 Preferably Should Not	5 Absolutely Must Not
1. Explain the school's educational program to the community.	____	____	____	____	____
2. Organize classes to provide for racial integration within the school.	____	____	____	____	____
3. Consult with staff representatives before changes in school policies and programs are made.	____	____	____	____	____
4. Provide programs for pupils with special educational, emotional, and physical needs.	____	____	____	____	____
5. Encourage parents and teachers to participate in developing the school's educational program.	____	____	____	____	____
6. Develop a guidance program in the school.	____	____	____	____	____
7. Make school facilities available to the community.	____	____	____	____	____

	1 Absolutely Must	2 Preferably Should	3 May or May Not	4 Preferably Should Not	5 Absolutely Must Not
8. Make classroom visits to improve the teaching methods.					
9. Be ready to speak to all community groups when asked.					
10. Provide for citywide and local testing to determine the educational progress of pupils.					
11. Implement a school policy which he has set that is opposed by the community board.					
12. Consider local feelings about race, religion, and national origin when filling teaching positions.					
13. Provide on-the-job training for teachers and para-professionals.					
14. Implement a curriculum consisting primarily of reading, writing, and mathematics.					
15. Use community resources and agencies in a health education program for parents and pupils.					
16. Recommend the dismissal of popular teachers whose work is unsatisfactory.					
17. Take personal charge of after-school activities.					
18. Encourage teachers to use new curriculum materials and teaching methods.					
19. Create an atmosphere for teaching and learning in the school.					
20. Hold teachers accountable for pupil achievement.					

PLEASE LIST BY NUMBER, IN DESCENDING ORDER OF IMPORTANCE, THE FIVE (5) FUNCTIONS WHICH YOU CONSIDER TO BE MOST IMPORTANT FROM THE LIST OF 20 FUNCTIONS IN THIS PORTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

21. If you were selecting a principal for your school, what <u>five</u> personal characteristics would you consider most important?

(continued on page 4)

22. If you were selecting a principal for your school, what <u>five</u> professional experiences and characteristics would you consider most important?

(Thank you for completing this questionnaire.)